



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761114665912>

CA2 GN

XC2

-1990

052

Government
Publications



C-1 1991

C-1 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 9 January 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Organization



Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 9 janvier 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Organisation

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 362-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 9 January 1991

The committee met at 1005 in room 151.

ORGANIZATION

The Chair: Welcome, first of all, to the first meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I think those of us who have been given the responsibility and pleasure, if I can call it that, of being appointed to this committee are all looking forward to a useful discussion, not only among ourselves but certainly with as many people in the province of Ontario as possible.

I thought it would be useful in starting, particularly because of the audience and particularly because the meeting is being televised, to just review the terms of reference of the committee and then point out to people that this essentially is an organizational meeting.

We will proceed then to the election of the Vice-Chair and the setting up of the subcommittee which, again the members of the committee know but the members of the public may not know, is the subcommittee that is responsible for setting up the business of the committee *per se* in some of the details and reporting back to the committee obviously. From there I think it would be useful before we break today to have some general discussion about the way in which we want to approach our work.

As you know, I have tried to touch base with all of the members of the committee. I managed to talk to most people on the committee prior to the meeting and I think there is a general similarity in the way we see that we need to approach our work, but there are obviously a lot of details that we need to work out. My hope would be that we would have some general discussion and then perhaps recess to allow the subcommittee to meet and flesh out some of those details and possibly report back to the full committee later today if that is workable. We can get into that a little bit later.

Again, members of the committee would know but for the general public it may be useful to point out that the role of this committee is "to review and report on: (a) the social and economic interests and aspirations of all the people of Ontario within Confederation; and (b) what form of Confederation can most effectively meet the social and economic aspirations of the people of Ontario." Those are the written words.

I think what they say to me at least is that we want to try to get a feel for where the mood of the province is on the variety of issues related to the constitutional framework, particularly in the time frame that we are in in the post-Meech Lake era, and to use that as a basis of our reporting back to the Legislature on what directions the Legislature and the government ought to move in.

As people know, we are mandated to file an interim report in the Legislature by 21 March and then a final report by 27 June, so there are two stages in our work as

well. In doing that, we have been authorized to travel throughout the province, indeed even outside of the province if we think it is useful to do our work.

Without further ado, I will move then to the election of the Vice-Chair and call for nominations.

Mr F. Wilson: I would like to place Gilles Bisson's name in nomination for Vice-Chair of this committee.

The Chair: Mr Bisson has been nominated. Are there any other nominations? There being no further nominations, I declare nominations closed. Mr Bisson, you are elected as Vice-Chair.

The next item of business is the establishment of the subcommittee. Obviously the Chair and the Vice-Chair would be two of the members. There is a motion on that.

Mr Offer moves that in addition to the Chair and the Vice-Chair, Mr Beer and Mr Harnick do compose the subcommittee on business; that the subcommittee on business meet from time to time at the call of the Chair to consider and to report to the committee on the business of the committee; that substitutions be permitted in the subcommittee; and that the presence of all members of the subcommittee is necessary to constitute a quorum.

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: Okay. I think we can move to some general discussion on the nature of our work. As people know, we had a list of items that was circulated. I think they formed some of the framework for some of the discussions that we have had informally to date and that we may want to pick up on here today. I will just make a couple of opening comments and then open the floor for discussion.

It is clear to me at least that in what we are trying to do or what we want to do we need to try very hard not only to touch base as widely as possible but also to look at different ways of having discussions with the people of the province. I know we have looked at a couple of possibilities that we will be discussing in some detail in terms of adding to the traditional ways of holding hearings, some type of town hall meetings and some small group discussions, as well as a variety of ways in which the committee members can touch base with various constituencies in the province, whether they be young people in schools, colleges or universities or people from various ethnocultural groups, native groups, francophone groups, women's groups and so on. The list is obviously fairly wide.

We do have, as I indicated earlier, the authority to travel, certainly within the province and possibly even outside the province, and that is an area we need to take a look at in terms of how we do our work. I think we are conscious of the fact that what we need to do, at least in this first stage, is to get a good feel for the kinds of issues that are important to the people of the province and to be

able to point to some directions that we think the Legislature and the government ought to move in as the discussions around the future of the Constitution and indeed the country proceed in the months to come.

Without going on and on, I will stop at that point and certainly invite any comments or views from the members of the committee about any issues related to our work in a general way, and then also comment about the process of feeding all those to the subcommittee to work out some of the details.

Mr Beer: Mr Chair, may I at the outset congratulate you on your nomination for the position of Chairman, and also Mr Bisson. I know we are all going to get to know each other very well over the next number of months. As one of the members of the committee, along with Steve Offer and Ernie Eves, who had the opportunity to serve on the last constitutional committee, I can certainly assure everyone that it is always interesting, fascinating and at times unexpected, but I think the scope of our work is certainly awesome.

When we look at the time frame we have, I think it will be very important for the subcommittee to come to grips fairly quickly with the time that we have available and how we are going to get out and consult with the various individuals, groups and organizations as I know we would like to do.

It seems to me that one of the critical differences between this committee and the earlier one is that here we are not dealing with a specific document but rather with a much broader, in a sense, range of questions and issues. I am sure that some of those will be defined in the document that I believe the Premier indicated would be ready by the end of this month. I think one of the questions we would ask you, Mr Chairman, is if you could perhaps later just comment on when that paper may be available. I suspect that not only for us but for the different groups and individuals who want to appear before us that will serve as a useful document in terms of the kinds of questions we are looking at.

I think it is probably too early for us to set out exactly what the nature of the interim report ought to be, but I would like to just throw out a couple of comments on that, because it seems to me there are so many other things that are going on while we do our own work that it is going to be important for us both to be aware of what is going on and to determine among ourselves what it is that we want to do and what we feel we have to accomplish in order to bring in our final report at the end of June.

We start today and we know, as we all saw on the news last night, that the Spicer commission has started its work. I think, for example, it might be useful, Mr Chairman, to consider making direct contact through you with the different bodies that are also at work so that we know what they are doing and they know what we are about.

There was the interesting proposal made by Professor Peter Russell a month or two ago. He suggested that perhaps when these various committees and commissions have, if not finished their work but maybe when they are well under way, the various individuals who are working in Alberta or in Manitoba, New Brunswick, Ontario,

Quebec, come together in a kind of session for a couple of days to talk about what it is that we are hearing and what kinds of views are coming forward. I think that is perhaps an interesting element of our work and we should keep in contact with what is happening elsewhere.

In terms of the interim report, I think we want to leave open whether our interim report would simply bring the Legislature up to date on what we had been doing to that point. Do we want to complete all of our public hearings by 21 March or do we see that we want those public hearings to go on after? How do we deal with the fact that the Quebec report is supposed to be tabled on 28 March and the things that people might say to us before that could be different in terms of what might happen after? I think we need to think about that.

I guess the point would be that our key report is the one in June and that we do not want to get caught perhaps in trying to organize ourselves completely around the interim report but rather take advantage of the period from February to the end of June so that if we need a longer period for public consultation than from now until the middle of March, let's do that, let's say no then. If that is the time we need, let's make sure that in fact we can do that.

If you look at the time frame when the House is not in session from now until 21 March, it really gives us four or maybe five weeks when we could be out around the province. When you start to think of the various areas of the north and indeed the whole province where we would like to go, that is a very short period of time when we know we do not want to just appear as a committee with groups coming to us, making presentations, a few questions and leaving, but also to do some outreach, getting out to meet with young people, getting out to meet with the various cultural and community groups in the different centres that we visit so that we have a much better idea of what people think.

There are logistics, an organizational side of that which is going to take some careful planning, and I think this perhaps speaks to some of the needs that we will have from the staff side of help from people with community experience who can in effect go out as advance people to help organize in different communities to ensure that we will have people coming forward, and not just going out in the normal committee sense, which I think can be very useful for certain topics, but in one like this we want to get to where people are, put them in settings where they are at ease.

This can be a kind of an intimidating setup sometimes for people to come forward, and I think that we want to get more people who may not always think: "Well, no, I won't go before that committee. I'm not the kind of person that they want to hear from." But indeed we do. We want to reach out to the service clubs, to the church groups, to all of the different organizations out there, and not just to people who perhaps more traditionally come and appear before our committee. I think that is something that becomes very important.

The other element here is how we organize our research work. Assuming that, on the one side, one of the major phases is going out and meeting and hearing people,

the other, I think, is really that the questions we want to be asking in relationship to our topic of Ontario in Confederation are economic questions, questions related to proposals that we know might come from other parts of the country, whether Quebec or Alberta, to do with the Senate, to do with a more decentralized kind of federation. What are the implications? What are the consequences of a whole series of questions, and how do we organize ourselves as a committee?

The mandate indicates that we can call on resources to do a number of things. We know that the government itself is organized in a certain way to try to deal with some of these questions, but to what extent do we as a committee want to have some independent views, where we might need frankly more than all the tremendous resources that I know the research staff can provide? We may very much want to call upon other experts out there to do particular work.

I think, in order to determine what that is, we have to have a sense of what is going on within the government, what can be available to us, and then what the other needs are that we see we have so that that work can be started. Then later, as we finish our public consultation and begin to look in particular at the second part of the mandate, what form of Confederation can most effectively meet the province's needs, we can take advantage of that. I think that is another element.

There are the two and they have to go on at the same time, the public consultation and the planning of the work, so that we can then arrive at a report. But I would urge us to look at our full time frame as we set that out and not to sense that somehow the interim report has got to mark a very clear dividing line. We may come to the conclusion that it should, and there may be some very valid reasons why that is so, but I think at the present time, as we begin, there is still much that we have to learn.

1020

The final point I would make is just that I think it is important that as a committee we consider in the early days arranging for briefings that will bring us up to steam in terms of what has been going on elsewhere and what are a variety of the ideas and concepts that are out there. I think this will help us in understanding better what has transpired since the end of Meech, a better idea specifically of what other committees and commissions are looking at.

Also, and I think both Steve and Ernie would agree with this, in a committee such as this I think it is very important that we come together as a committee so that we can speak frankly and openly with each other without concern. I think, as I believe we tried to do in the other committee, this is an issue where there are political issues, and those are legitimate and they are real, but that it is not a partisan discussion in the normal sense. What we see we have here is an issue where we do not have the answers at this time. Perhaps no one does, and perhaps the work we do will lead in a kind of building-block way, where if you take the reports from Ontario, the other provinces, from Spicer and so on, we would begin to bring together what could ultimately become an answer. So as we go forward

with our own work, I think that interaction and our sense of working together becomes terribly important. Those would be my preliminary considerations that I would want to put forward.

The Chair: Thank you; a number of useful comments. I want to make one comment following from what you said, particularly on the discussion paper, the first item you mentioned, because I had wanted to say something about that earlier. Members of the committee I think are all aware that the discussion paper, which is really the first stage or step of the two-step process of which the committee's work is the second, will be out, I am told, before the end of January. That is something that obviously we all expect will happen. I think there are some real efforts under way to try to get it out as soon as possible, even prior to the end of the month; I think the people are just working through the logistics of that.

That, obviously, will raise a number of the questions that were in the Premier's statement and will flesh them out a little more and try to set a framework for some questions in some of those areas which I think will cover a variety of issues both economic and social that people can then respond to. Obviously, people can respond in whatever way and to whatever they wish, whether or not it is covered in the discussion paper, but I think the attempt is there to at least raise some questions for people to address. Certainly, that would then give us the possibility to look at our hearings in the formal sense beginning probably some time in February and, as you say, probably looking at a four- to five-week span initially to do that in.

Are there other comments?

Mr Eves: Mr Chairman, I would like to welcome you, and especially the new members of the committee, to the committee. I think, as Mr Beer has indicated, you will find this to be a truly non-partisan process, as indeed I think it should be. I really enjoyed sitting on the previous committee, which dealt with not only the Meech Lake accord but also Senate reform. It is, of course, a very all-encompassing subject we are about to embark on here now.

I think it is very important for us to reach out to people in all walks of life in the province and to understand where people from across the province are coming from. I would commend the Chairman and his remarks regarding some innovative approaches to reaching out to people who ordinarily would not offer themselves up here as a sacrifice in what, to Mr Beer, is regarded as a somewhat imposing process, as indeed it can be to a lot of the people out there at different times.

I think it is also important, though, on behalf of the province, for us to understand what other provinces—and, more important, people in other provinces—think and feel. The problem we seem to have before us is that we have perhaps five months at most to accomplish what I think is a very, very large task. I totally agree with the comments Mr Beer has made that we should regard our time line as not being from now until the House reconvenes in March or 21 March, the date of the interim report, but that we should view this as an all-encompassing task which is going to take us at least until the end of June. It may

require a lot of committee members sacrificing of their own time after the House reconvenes, time they would normally be spending in their constituency or other places.

I would agree with the comments Charles has made with respect to Intergovernmental Affairs. I think it would help all committee members tremendously if we were able to line up some briefing meetings in either the last few days of January or the first few days of February before we embark upon our public consultation process.

Just to sum up, I again welcome especially the new members to the committee, because I think you will find it to be a very worthwhile endeavour indeed.

The Chair: Those of us who are new, and that is the vast majority of people here, I guess primarily on the government side, are certainly looking forward to the expertise and experience from some of you who have been through this process in the past. The comments that have been made both by you and Mr Beer in terms of treating this as a non-partisan issue are certainly something that is felt very strongly on the part of the government members. I know that that is something we will strive for; certainly I, as Chair, will try to continue to have us work in the co-operative mode we seem to be starting.

Ms Churley: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I, too, would like to congratulate you on your appointment. Knowing you from the board of education for so many years and as chair, where you did a very good job, I have every confidence that you will be able to carry this very difficult task forward. In true partisan spirit—non-partisan—that was a Freudian slip, was it not?—

Mr Beer: We'll have other places to do that.

Ms Churley: Exactly. I would agree with the comments made by the two previous speakers. I certainly advise the subcommittee—I am sure this is a priority—to begin the process of planning or outreach as quickly as possible, because, as has been mentioned, we have a very short time in which to consult a lot of people, and there is always a danger in these kinds of committees going around the province to leave a lot of people out, obviously inadvertently, but it often happens. It is very difficult in such a short time to do the kind of outreach that is necessary to get everybody who has an interest in this matter involved, and the quicker we can get on with some kind of outreach the better. I am not sure who is going to do that or how it is going to be done, to find innovative ways to very quickly let people know we are coming and that we really want to hear from them.

I was quite impressed with the story I read in the *Globe and Mail* this morning; the first session of the Spicer commission and the young people. I do not know if people had a chance to see that this morning, but I was impressed by the kind of presentation the high school students made. I think young people should be given some kind of priority. I think this must be a somewhat disheartening situation for young people, given everything else that is going on in the world right now, dealing with that but also to be in the midst of seeing our country fall apart. I think we, as a committee, have a lot to offer in giving these young people a chance to speak about what they are feeling and where

we should be going, because, as these students said in this article, it is their future. They are going to be around a lot longer; I hate to think about that, but it is true. I have a daughter who is almost 17—I am sure many of us do—and I think it is very important to listen to the voices of young people.

Another aspect I noticed in the same story which I found very interesting was that these young people mentioned the environment. I would like to make a point of reaching out to natives and women, because I have some personal concerns, as I think we all do, about problems in the Meech Lake accord. I think we need to hear more about and from women and natives and young people, also the environment, the fact that that was mentioned by the young people. I think it is an interesting perspective. I know when I have travelled outside of Canada I was very proud to put a maple leaf on my backpack; I noticed people liked me better when they found out I was not an American, that I was a Canadian. I have always been very proud to display that maple leaf and to say, "I am from Canada."

1030

People have a concept of Canada. When you think of the environment, you think of clean and you think of the snow; we think, in many ways, of the environment and our perception of it. Now there are environmental problems. We are degrading our environment across the country. I do not quite know what it is yet, but to me there is an element there, the feelings we all have as Canadians about preserving our natural environment, that we should explore.

I am very much looking forward to getting to know my colleagues and to this trip. I am very much looking forward to listening to the people of Ontario and hearing all the different viewpoints. I agree that we can move forward. We can make decisions later about where we go after March. It occurs to me that we probably will have to stop travelling in early March. That really shortens our time to be able to pull together what we have learned.

I agree that it is necessary, at least for the Chair and the subcommittee, to keep in touch with the other committees that are being struck all across the country—I believe there probably will be more in a very short time—to make sure that we know what is going on in other areas. I think we will be able to make decisions as we go along about where we go on our fact-finding mission and what we then do with that. I tend to agree that this is an ongoing process.

I am very honoured to have been chosen to serve on this committee; I am sure it is important to everybody in this room. I come from Newfoundland. In fact—I will age myself here—I was born a year before Newfoundland joined Confederation. I grew up with my grandmother telling me what it was like for her, as a Newfoundlander, to join Canada. So I have a very strong attachment to this country. I have also lived in Quebec and on the west coast and have a very deep commitment to doing anything I can to help hold this country together.

Mr Offer: If I may add to the discussion, I believe there have initially been some important questions raised on the initial formal meeting of this committee and the

necessity for a briefing of this committee by individuals as yet unknown; questions dealing with the date on which public hearings will commence and in which cities they should commence; as well, as a subset of that, any outreach type of program that we, as a committee, might want to undertake and the framework and the process for how we will in fact undertake that; questions dealing with the nature and extent of research and the questions that we may want to be answered.

There is also, of course, the necessity for us to report back on a budget for this committee so that it can proceed further. It would be important to deal with all of these questions. I imagine it would be done through the subcommittee, but I believe it is crucially important that we deal with these types of questions as soon as possible so we can get on with this very important task of consulting the people of this province. I believe the subcommittee, as soon as possible, today, should deal with these issues so it can report back to the committee and we can proceed.

The Chair: As I indicated earlier, I think that would be the way to go if people are comfortable with that. If there are no additional comments, we could have the meeting of the subcommittee follow immediately. I would like to get a sense from the members of the committee of

whether we would be prepared to recess the meeting of this committee and come back later this afternoon; in the meantime have the subcommittee meet and flesh out as much as it can in the intervening time and then report back to the committee some time this afternoon. I hope everyone's schedule allows for that to happen for later today. I see nodding.

Mr F. Wilson: If you could give us some sense of the time you are talking about.

The Chair: We would have to set a specific time. It is now 10:40, roughly.

Mr F. Wilson: Would 2 pm or 3 pm—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Why do we not make it 2:30 and compromise?

Mr F. Wilson: You say 2:30. Why not make it 2:45?

The Chair: Okay, 2:30. The clerk says if there is a problem with that we will contact your offices and let you know. We will recess, then, until 2:30. The members of the subcommittee will stay and we will meet either here or elsewhere and proceed with those discussions.

The committee recessed at 1038.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1504.

The Chair: We have one piece of information that is on its way to us. I can read it, but it would probably be useful to put that in front of people. It is the proposed list of communities to visit. The subcommittee has been meeting and we have come up with a report to the full committee, which is perhaps not as finely tuned as we would like it to be, but we thought it was important to come back as close to the time we had suggested as we could. I am going to read out the report from the subcommittee.

"The subcommittee agreed that the committee will request to meet during the weeks of January 27; February 3, 10, 17 and 24; March 3 and on Monday, March 18.

"The subcommittee suggests that the time between now and the March 21 deadline for the submission of an interim report be viewed as simply the first stage of a longer discussion process," and in that sense it cannot be exhaustive.

The subcommittee is suggesting that we travel too, and we now have a group of communities that we have grouped together into four areas. If members of the committee can see the map out there, it basically groups them together. We have copies that we are going to distribute at this point, so perhaps I will just wait until that happens.

As you can see, the tentative routes and locations that we have set out are, in the first block, Kenora, Sioux Lookout, Dryden, Thunder Bay and Sault Ste Marie; in the second block, Timmins, Kirkland Lake, North Bay and Sudbury; in the third block, Windsor, London, Brantford, Hamilton/St Catharines; and in the fourth block, Ottawa, Cornwall, Kingston and Toronto. At this point we are suggesting that be the sequence, subject to whatever the technical aspects of doing things might require, if any changes are required as a result of that. The actual travel part would begin the week of 3 February in our recommendation.

"The first part of the hearings would be to solicit the views of the people of Ontario regarding the place of Ontario within Confederation. The committee will attempt to contact as many people as possible and as wide a range of people as possible. In order to accomplish this, the subcommittee recommends that in addition to the regular format of hearings, small or more informal meetings be held, and at the discretion of the committee these informal meetings not be televised or recorded on Hansard.

"The subcommittee recommends that the committee delegate the approval of advertising, meeting arrangements and other administrative matters to the subcommittee.

"The subcommittee further recommends that the Chair contact the committees and commissions of the other provinces and the federal government to discuss the sharing of information with those bodies and possible joint meetings with those bodies at some later point.

Finally, "The subcommittee recommends that the committee have briefings during the week of January 28 on constitutional events across Canada since the Meech Lake accord and to receive a broad overview of issues concerning constitutional matters."

That is the report of the subcommittee. I think, as you can see, we have tried to sort of just set out a situation where we will use a bit of time towards the end of this month to receive some briefings, then use the month of February to do the bulk of the travel, recognizing that it will only allow us to get an initial sense of where the province of Ontario is on these matters and then allow us to reflect that in our interim report to the Legislature by the deadline of 21 March.

The subcommittee will be meeting next week to discuss some of the other aspects, such as, of course, the budget proposal that we need to pull together and particularly what we need to do to do a serious outreach, and what assistance we may need with that if we want to seriously go beyond the traditional mode of holding discussions and how we go about identifying and making sure that we have touched base with all the different constituencies across the province that we need to talk to, if we are to reflect very clearly the feelings of a cross-section of the province in our report.

Mr F. Wilson: Do you need someone to move acceptance before discussion?

The Chair: Sure, yes. Actually, I guess the subcommittee report is open for debate, so go ahead.

Mr F. Wilson: I move acceptance of the subcommittee's report.

Mr Eves: As to the week of 4 March, what is it the subcommittee plans on doing?

The Chair: That will be the time that we expect we will be spending in effect pulling together the interim report, because that is the week following the end of our hearings.

Mr Eves: Are there caucus meetings going on that week, like two or three meetings?

The Chair: Yes, we are conscious of the caucus meetings and hope that the caucus meetings will end up being on the same days or with enough of an overlap that we can then use the rest of the week.

Mr Eves: Did the subcommittee address the issue of hearing viewpoints from other provincial legislatures?

The Chair: Yes, we did. That is something that we no doubt will come back to. What we have agreed to at this point is that an initial approach on our part should be to make contact with the other commissions, groups and committees and to leave open the possibility for some discussion depending on the kind of response we get from those bodies.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We have Toronto listed here in the same typeset as places like Cornwall and Thunder Bay. Toronto has always been the focus of hearings. I understand, I think, why this is like it is in that we are going to have to go back to the Legislative Assembly for the second half, certainly, of our work. Is that going to be somehow explained, in that usually committee hearings have a lot of their time in Toronto, and people expect that? You are the person who is much more conscious than I of the Toronto

constituency. How do you explain this or are there going to be, for instance, in that week, two days in Toronto and half a day in Ottawa?

The Chair: We have not worked out those details. That is what the subcommittee is going to be looking at, which is why we put this out as a tentative list, so that we have a feeling of managing to cover at least the various regions of the province in some reasonable fashion and trying to go beyond what committees would normally do in these kinds of situations. But I hear what you are saying. I am sure the other members of the subcommittee do as well. We will have to take a look at how we can address that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Will you be keeping this tentative until the advertisements have been circulating for a couple of weeks? I guess what I am thinking of is that Thunder Bay may have 10 people and the Sault may have two groups of people. I just wonder how long this stays tentative and how your thoughts are coming together on how or when it will change.

1510

The Chair: I think our sense was that we needed to firm it up as soon as we could because of the need to make the arrangements, and our desire as well to be able to use the time in the particular communities so that in addition to holding the traditional type of hearings, we also allow members of the committee to maybe reach out in some informal ways, as we have indicated, to various constituencies within each of those communities.

Having said that, again, I think that with the point we have reached now, the staff would be taking a look at the mechanics of putting this kind of itinerary together and will report back to us next week when we meet again. If problems develop, then we can take those into account, and obviously take into account the kinds of comments you are making to us.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think it is really important—you have said it from the very beginning and I hope you will repeat it—that this is a different approach, because this is definitely a great break from the way in which we have usually handled committee hearings as such.

The Chair: My sense, and I am sure the other members would agree, as far as one of the first comments you made about Toronto is concerned, is that it will be easier to add time for hearings in Toronto than it would be for any other community, obviously, because of the fact that we tend to be here so much of the time. That is something we could even adjust as we go on.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think that needs explanation in a bold handout of this sheet; I think it could be misinterpreted.

The Chair: Right.

Mr F. Wilson: One suggestion and one quick question: On category 4, the eastern Ontario region, could I suggest that the subcommittee revisit that group and perhaps add one more location? Knowing that area well, I find it difficult to think that Peterborough would not be

there as a very central location for the east-central area. It would round that off nicely.

The question is, is there significance to the progression of categories here, north first followed by southwest?

The Chair: I think we had probably the strongest feelings about starting out with the group of communities in the northwest, but the rest we felt fitted in nicely as a sequence. But there is no magic to it, no.

Mr F. Wilson: That would be a suggestion I would have for the committee too, that perhaps it would be appropriate to start in the north.

The Chair: Yes, sorry. What we are suggesting is that unless people feel otherwise, this be the sequence, as it is outlined here, but as I say, we did not feel that strongly about it beyond the first grouping.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You set down the days?

The Chair: You mean days of the week?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes.

The Chair: Yes. We were looking generally at Monday through Thursday, recognizing that a lot of that would probably involve a lot of travel time during the day and meetings in the evening, and as much as possible our meeting times would actually be in the evening to facilitate to the largest degree possible being available to people in those communities. But generally the Monday through Thursday.

I think we recognized that during that first week we might have to extend that a little bit in order to accommodate all of those communities, and so we might be looking there at either a Sunday afternoon or Sunday night departure or possibly an extension into Friday.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Let's hope the weather patterns of this province co-operate in the month of February.

The Chair: We are anticipating complete co-operation on the weather front on this.

Mr F. Wilson: I have another suggestion. I noticed too in that same category, and this is only a suggestion that should be thought out further, that an addition to that would be Pembroke. There seems to be a large gap of area between North Bay and Ottawa. It might be appropriate. I just offer that as a suggestion.

The Chair: We will certainly take a look at that. The problem I am sure we will come up with again is the time constraints. Quite frankly, knowing that we want, or are supposed to have, as much as we can of the proceedings televised, that also has some technical implications as to how easily we can move around, although we have tried very much not to have that dictate what we do. We will take a look at those two suggestions you have made as well.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Pembroke people have often come to Ottawa for presentations when committees have travelled.

Ms Churley: Have you—perhaps I missed it—outlined the mode of transportation? Have you discussed that yet?

The Chair: No, we have not. Sorry, we discussed it; I had not said—

Ms Churley: In February in Ontario?

The Chair: We talked about a variety of ways. Obviously in some cases we are going to have to fly to particular destinations. Then what we would like to do is to take a look at, within each of the groupings to whatever extent possible, trying to travel by bus or other modes of transportation. Again, that is something that we will have to fine-tune as we go along. As I see the smiles developing across, I—

Ms Churley: In anticipation.

The Chair: Yes. It is something that we have not quite worked out yet.

Mr Beer: I think one of the things that we just really wanted to underline when we were looking at these groupings in the subcommittee was that in addition to what people normally see as the way committees of the Legislature go around the province and have sessions—we will be doing those, but the importance in stressing the informal other kinds of meetings, outreach, that we hope to set up so that we will be able to find groups of students, nurses, perhaps church groups, whatever, but really trying to explore to make the maximum use of the time that we are in those communities, over and above what would be perhaps the more standard sessions of the committee.

We really said to ourselves that the reason we want to get as much into the month of February as possible is that this is a time of listening. We are going to be doing more of that later, but because of the way that March falls out, we really had to make as much use of those four weeks as possible and, I think, focus on that and really expand the number of communities. Often, committees do not get into as many communities as this, and if we can add a few more, as has been suggested, I think we would want to try to do that. Our feeling is that we will be able to reach a great number of people this way, both through the more formal meetings of the committee and through some of the more ad hoc, where we might split up into smaller groups and just go out and chat with people. I think recognizing that we are going to be doing some things differently. That is good. We want to try to do that so that we maximize the contacts that we make with Ontarians.

Ms Churley: I just want to make a suggestion that may not be able to be answered now. It is on a different train of thought.

In terms of approaching people in all these communities, are we going out with a kind of blank slate with no background material? I guess we need to have a discussion at some point about our terms of reference, in terms of what it is we are saying to people. Are we giving them any kind of overview of anything? Have we thought about what our approach is when we go to these communities?

The Chair: Certainly, we know and we obviously kept very much in mind as we were planning the schedule that the discussion paper from the government will be out, if everything goes according to schedule, before the end of January.

Ms Churley: And that will be used as the background.

The Chair: Yes. If the committee feels that we need to do anything beyond that, we certainly can do that. Part of our briefing and information session in that latter part of January will in fact involve being able to review with the appropriate representatives of the government the contents of that paper and any other related issues that we need to take a look at and at least have some general sense of before we go out in the hearings.

Ms Churley: So this discussion paper, if all goes well according to time, will be sent in vast numbers to the population all over the province.

The Chair: Yes. It will be distributed to whatever mailing lists exist within any ministries of the government. I think they are anticipating, therefore, a very vast distribution. That list will certainly be available to this committee as well in terms of anything else that we may wish to do.

Mr F. Wilson: Did the subcommittee address the need to advertise?

The Chair: Yes, and that is also one of the issues that we will be taking a closer look at because, again, we think we may need to do some things a little bit differently as well, perhaps using the same kinds of budgets and amounts that are traditionally used but using them in a slightly different way.

Mr F. Wilson: If it is appropriate, I have another suggestion for that, if it is even possible, that when we do advertise, the advertisement be used as a method to give people some pointers or some direction on what discussion will take place; not to sort of restrict what we will discuss, but something to hang their presentations on.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Besides the people on the ministry mailing lists, would we be inviting people to request copies? I do not think we want to model on Spicer, but we are getting some kind of direction there that they are trying to get a very democratic process, and I think we should make this discussion paper available to anyone in the province who wants it.

The Chair: Absolutely.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I know that is unusual, but I think we should have a call-in number or a mailing address to let this be open and accessible.

The Chair: Absolutely. I think that is something we would all want to see, and again, we can work that out, either through the committee itself or through whatever other system here makes sense to do that, so that people could call and get a copy of the paper if they did not have it. Obviously, we would be wanting the paper available as widely as possible, in addition to the mailing list, in whatever public places across the province would make sense.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you spoken at all about having it translated?

The Chair: The paper will certainly go out in English and French, and I gather there also will be a summary of that put together, which then could easily be translated into other languages.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: There seem to be seven or eight languages that most ministries from time to time publish in.

You may want to discuss if you wanted to broaden into two or three of those at least, particularly at least one of the Oriental languages.

The Chair: Certainly.

Mr Winninger: I know the Chair is cognizant of the need, if we are dialoguing with native communities, to meet them on their own territory, as it were. I would hope that this tentative list of routes does not become inflexible so that we cannot set up media coverage and so on if we do want to travel, however inconvenient, to certain native communities in all parts of the province.

The Chair: We talked about that, actually, and our hope is that we have in fact set out some of the communities that would allow us to do that, particularly in the north and certainly in other parts of the province as well. But again, that is also part of the kind of fine-tuning that we want to be able to do if in fact we have not done that properly.

If there are no further comments, then we will take the subcommittee report as being approved. The subcommittee

will certainly look at the suggestions that have been made of other things to add or consider in addition to what we have recommended.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Do you expect to have a meeting of the whole committee next week after your subcommittee meeting?

The Chair: At this point we do not think so, but we will certainly just keep track of that through the representatives from each of the parties. We tried not to, because we know that everyone is involved in other committees in the next couple of weeks, but we do not anticipate any problems.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The week of the 27th, is that the first week at this moment?

The Chair: At this moment, yes. If we have a different sense after our meeting next week, then we can pull one together for the week after that.

The committee adjourned at 1527.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 9 January 1991

Organization	C-1
Afternoon sitting	C-6
Adjournment	C-9

SELECT CONNITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION**Chair:** Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winner, David (London South NDP)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis**Staff:** Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

HANSARD REPORTING SERVICE

Room 481, Legislative Building, Queen's Park, Toronto, M7A 1A2

Telephone (416) 965-1456

Index Inquiries: (416) 965-2159

Facsimile: (416) 963-1387

Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Editors: Alex Jenkins, *Acting Editorial Chief*;

Edward Patrick, *Editorial Supervisor*;

Karen Bennett, Liese Binnie, Drummond Burgess, John Cambridge,

Deborah Caruso, Anne Lynas, Steven Smal, Janice Spellerberg,

Sheila Wawanash, Sharon Wyatt

Reporters (Tape): Kit Anderson-Knight, *Administrator*;

Margaret Elkins, Wilda Ferguson, *Supervisors*;

Jean Andrews, Sandra Arrizza, Peggy Brooks, Carolyn Brown,

Arlene Cedilnik, Sharon Chalupiak, Karen Fischer, Margaret Grobicka,

Timothy Humphries, Kathleen Oram, Arleen Oostwoud, Chantal Perron,

Mary Sutton, Lorraine Wills

Reporters (Shorthand): Pat Girouard, Beth Grahame, Carol McIntosh,

Maureen Murphy

Reference: Teresa Kerr, *Reference co-ordinator*; Miro Drobnjakovic

Index: Elise Sloga, *Chief*; Estelita Chan, Lynda Middleton

Editorial Assistants: Bob Bubba, Corrine Marnoch, David Woodruff

Printer: Eamon Kade

Secretary/Receptionist: Lorraine Cohen

Messenger: Tom Grahame

C420N
XC2
-1990
052

U
F



C-2 1991

C-2 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 28 January 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Briefings

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 28 janvier 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Séances d'information



Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Monday 28 January 1991

The committee met at 1612 in room 151.

The Chair: If I can call the meeting to order, welcome back to the members of the committee. For the members of the public who are following us on the parliamentary channel, this is of course a meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. Essentially, today's meeting is to allow the committee to get a briefing on some of the issues we need to keep in mind, particularly in terms of some of the things that are happening elsewhere in the country on the whole constitutional front and discussions happening through the various commissions or committees across the country. We will be getting some of that from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs in a moment.

As committee members know, tomorrow the discussion paper will be released by the government. At this point, it looks as if the meeting we had previously scheduled for the morning will have to be changed to the afternoon—probably 4 or, as I have now heard, 4:30 might make more sense; we can sort that out later on—to allow us to have a briefing on the discussion paper tomorrow once the document is public.

We will also be getting some information from our legislative research staff on some of the work that has happened on the constitutional issues within Ontario in the past, leading up to the present time. Obviously, there will be some internal business of the committee that we will have to sort out as well today.

I did also want to say in starting that all of us are conscious that as we begin this work, our work may be affected and indeed probably will be affected by the events going on in the Gulf. I think we are conscious of the fact that our own thoughts and people's thoughts out there are by and large on what is going on in the Gulf. We have discussed informally, of course, what we ought to do about that. I think our sense at this point is that we need to continue with our work, keeping very much in mind the mood other people are in and the effect that what is going on in the Gulf is having on everyone. Just be conscious of that as we continue and make it clear that this is something we are also concerned about as members of the committee.

MINISTRY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Chair: I think we can proceed. I will invite the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr Obonsawin, and his staff to join us at the table. Perhaps you could introduce the members of your staff, and we will let you carry on.

Mr Obonsawin: As everyone is taking their seats, could I introduce, starting from my far left, Tone Careless. Mr Careless is the senior policy co-ordinator on constitutional policy with the Ministry of the Attorney General. Next to Mr Careless is Louise Barry. Louise is an intergov-

ernmental affairs officer with the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs and has been following more closely within the ministry over the past few months the discussions of the Bélanger-Campeau commission in Quebec. Next to me is Peter Sadlier-Brown. Peter is the assistant deputy minister of our office of federal-provincial relations within the ministry. To my immediate right is Chris Bredt. Chris is the director of the constitutional policy division within the Ministry of the Attorney General.

What we would like to do for the committee today is go over relatively briefly what we think are some initial key elements to the discussion. With your permission, Mr Chairman, and with the permission of the committee members, we would like to offer our thoughts within the first, let's say, 15 or 20 minutes. Then, following that, we would certainly welcome any questions and clarification. If we are able to give the bulk of the presentation at the same time, it just ensures some sort of consistency and follow-through in our approach.

To do that, I would like to invite Mr Bredt, first, to give you basically an overview of what the Constitution is and what are some of the important elements of this document we call the Constitution, which is to a certain extent the source of a number of our discussions. I will then try very briefly to give you a sense of what are some of the other elements in the environment that are deemed to be appropriate or in contention at this time, and then finish by very briefly trying to give you an overview of what the other provinces and other jurisdictions are doing, a little of the environment against which this select committee will be consulting in the company of a number of other committees across this country.

Mr Bredt: I thought it would be helpful for this committee to give you a kind of Cook's tour of the Constitution, an overview, to give you a basic understanding of the four fundamental areas of the Constitution.

It is important to recognize that the Constitution of Canada is largely contained in two documents. They are the Constitution Act, 1867, which was passed at the time of Confederation, and the Constitution Act, 1982, which is the act that was enacted in 1982 following a series of negotiations.

In talking about the Constitution, I am going to focus on four fundamental areas: first, national institutions; second, the division of powers between federal and provincial governments; third, fundamental rights, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; and, fourth, processes of the Constitution, primarily the amending formula.

Turning first to national institutions, the national institutions include the executive, the legislative and the judicial branches of government and are defined by the first Constitution Act, that is, the Constitution Act of 1867. Part III of that act vests executive government in the Queen and

creates the position of Governor General to act as the Queen's representative in Canada, and also creates the Privy Council as a body to advise on the government of Canada.

The legislative branch of government is defined in Part IV of the 1867 Constitution. It creates the Parliament of Canada, which consists of the Senate and the House of Commons. The Senate, as I am sure you are aware, is made up of 104 senators who are appointed by the Governor General in Council, with representation divided as follows: Quebec and Ontario each have 24 senators; Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia—all the western provinces—have six senators each; Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have 10 senators; Prince Edward Island has four; Newfoundland, six, and the Northwest Territories and the Yukon each have one senator.

1620

The House of Commons has 295 members and they are elected. The seats in the House are generally allocated based on the principle of representation by population. This of course is subject to a number of special rules, including the rule that each province must have at least as many members of the House as they have in the Senate. In theory, the powers of the Senate and the House of Commons are equal, with the caveat that money bills must originate in the House of Commons. The only method for breaking a deadlock is the power of the Governor General to appoint additional senators. Of course, you will all be aware that this power is now the subject of some litigation.

The third part of the national institutions is the judiciary. That is defined in part VII of the Constitution Act, 1867. The federal government is given the power to appoint all superior court judges. The federal government is also given the power to create a general Court of Appeal for Canada and has done so by creating the Supreme Court of Canada. It is important to note that that Supreme Court of Canada is not entrenched in the Constitution. The federal government, simply by repealing the Supreme Court Act, could eliminate that body at present.

The second major area of the Constitution I want to talk to you about is that of the division of powers between the federal and the provincial governments. Canada is established as a federal system with provincial governments and a federal government, each with its own specific areas of jurisdiction. Sections 91 and 92 of the 1867 act set out the basic division of powers.

The federal government is given power over those matters generally of national concern, things like interprovincial trade and commerce, the postal service, national defence, currency and banking, patents and copyright, the criminal law. The federal government is also given a general power to make laws for the peace, order and good government in Canada in relation to all matters not exclusively assigned to the provinces.

Provinces, on the other hand, are given jurisdiction over matters viewed as being more of local or private concern, such as education, hospitals and medical services, the administration of justice and property and civil rights in the province. Agriculture and immigration are shared areas of jurisdiction, with the federal legislation being para-

mount. This reflects in part the fact that in 1867 immigration was linked to agriculture, as the latter was a primary occupation of most new settlers to Canada in 1867.

I turn now to the third major area in the Constitution, that is, the area of fundamental rights and primarily the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In the previous section, I described the powers allocated to each level of government. This section describes instead the rights and freedoms given to the people of Canada to protect them against either level of government. The charter is found in the 1982 Constitution Act. It is important to note that the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter give protection against government action, not against private action. For example, discrimination by government is caught by the charter but discrimination by private individuals or by companies is not. Private discrimination is, however, subject to such legislation as the Ontario Human Rights Code.

The rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter include fundamental freedoms such as freedom of religion, of expression, of association; democratic rights such as the right to vote in or run for election to the House of Commons or a Legislative Assembly; mobility rights including the right to enter, remain in and leave Canada; legal rights including the right to life, liberty and the security of the person; the right not to be arbitrarily detained and the right not to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment; equality rights, the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability; and language and minority education rights, including the recognition of the English and French languages as the official languages of Canada.

The charter also contains a number of general provisions that make clear that it is to be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canada and that the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter are guaranteed equally to men and to women.

There are two important limitations on the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter. The first is section 1 of the charter, which makes clear that the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the charter are subject to such reasonable limitations as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society. The second limitation is section 33 of the charter, which is also known as the "notwithstanding" clause. This clause permits governments to override the charter.

Finally, I should note that section 35 of the 1982 Constitution Act, which is not part of the charter and accordingly is not subject to section 1 or section 33, the "notwithstanding" clause I spoke about earlier, protects the aboriginal and treaty rights of the aboriginal people of Canada.

I turn now to the final major area of the Constitution, and that is the amending formula—or formulas, because contained in part V of the 1982 Constitution Act are four different procedures for amending the Constitution. Under section 41, unanimous consent of Parliament and of all provincial Legislatures is required for a limited range of fundamental matters, including those things affecting the

Supreme Court and changes to the amending formula itself.

Under section 38 and section 42, consent of Parliament and at least seven provincial Legislatures representing at least 50% of the Canadian population is required for most other matters. This is known as the 7-50 formula and is subject to a three-year time limit. This means that a proposed amendment under this section must achieve the required 7-50 within three years of the resolution initiating the amendment.

Section 43 of the 1982 act provides that amendments that affect one or more but not all provinces require only the consent of Parliament and of the Legislatures of the provinces affected. Thus, in the Meech Lake discussions, New Brunswick sought to entrench its bilingual status. Because this affected only New Brunswick, only the consent of the federal Parliament and the legislature of New Brunswick was required.

Finally, I note that pursuant to sections 44 and 45, both Parliament and each provincial legislature may unilaterally make certain kinds of amendments to their own internal constitutions.

This, then, is just a quick overview of the Constitution, and at the end of this presentation if any of the members here have questions I would be happy to respond to them at that time.

Mr Obonsawin: I have been doing this for a year and a half and I still have questions on that part of the activity. It is in one way the most frustrating because it tends to be wrapped up in a lot of the legalistic approaches to it, but on the other hand, when people start sitting down and talking about their values and talking about what are some of the things they want to change, they somehow always come back to the Constitution and how they are embodied in the Constitution and reflected in the Constitution.

What I would like to do now is simply give you a little bit of history, a very quick history of some of the major episodes in the constitutional debate within Canada. Both of your research people, Mr Murray and Mr Kaye, I am sure, will be able to fill in the gaps and give you a few more of the details and possibly will be, I think, focusing on the Ontario experience.

1630

Just to try to give you, necessarily very briefly in 5 or 10 minutes, a sense of the history and what has brought us to this current situation. I suppose that our history could in fact be traced to a series of first ministers' conferences that in fact began in 1968. They began in 1968 basically to try to accomplish two issues, one to deal with Quebec's sense of dissatisfaction with, at that time, its constitutional fate, and at the same time, back in 1968, to deal with division of responsibilities, roles and responsibilities, between the federal government and the provinces. There were a number, as you know, of events which followed the tentative agreement of what was called the Victoria formula, which was an amending process that had been put together in Victoria back in 1971. There were then a number of other elections which culminated in the referendum in 1980 in Quebec. At that point in time, the arguments against the referendum

had basically been that a no vote would be reflected in a renewed federalism at that time.

Consequently, in light of the referendum, in light of the federal government's desire to push forward a constitutional solution to the various questions that were outstanding, there was a constitutional conference in 1980 which was followed by another conference in 1981. That culminated in one of the documents that Chris Bredt spoke earlier about, the Constitution Act. It culminated in the Canada act of 1982, which included patriation of our Constitution back to the homeland and at the same time also made provisions for the Charter of Rights. However, at that time, for a number of reasons, Quebec refused to agree to the new constitutional framework, so their constitutional demands during that round had been left basically, from their perspective, unanswered.

At the same time, with the acceptance of the Constitution Act of 1982, there was a section in there which provided for a process whereby the rights and the aspirations of the aboriginal people would also be addressed. They would be addressed, as specified, through a series of first ministers' conferences. The first meeting was held in March 1983. At that meeting there was a commitment made for three additional first ministers' conferences on aboriginal issues. The final meeting on aboriginal issues culminated in 1987, in what I think has been regarded as a failure. The rights of the aboriginal people within the Constitution had again remained unresolved.

Between the commitments of the first ministers in 1983 to address the commitments of the aboriginal people and the failure of the processes with Quebec, a number of events took place which you may want to remember. First of all, there was the election of the new government in Quebec in 1985. There was a meeting in 1985 of first ministers. At that point they agreed that they would meet annually, and in 1985 there was an agreement to have an annual meeting for five years, at which time that five-year agreement could be renewed. As you know, that five-year agreement ended in 1990, and the desire to have that series of meetings has not been renewed. At the same time, in 1986, at the second meeting, the premiers agreed under what was called, and what you will be hearing in the future referred to as, the Edmonton declaration of 1986, that the constitutional priority of the first ministers would be Quebec. There was not a refusal to deal with other issues, but it was agreed in 1986 at that Edmonton declaration that Quebec's constitutional issues would be dealt with first.

Following that Edmonton declaration, the Quebec government outlined five requests or five points that it then sold, explained, defined across the country. It led to a convening of first ministers at Meech Lake in 1987 and a final agreement at Meech Lake—in Ottawa, actually—on 3 June 1987, the document that we have known over the past few years as Meech Lake.

Initially, there seemed to be a sigh of relief that there had been some progress done on the constitutional floor. However, five elements quickly changed, if you wish, the environment of those debates.

There were, first of all, concerns that the changes to the amending formula under Meech Lake would make Senate

reform difficult, if not impossible. The rights of the Canadian aboriginal people and multicultural groups were deemed to have been, by some, ignored. The rights of the north were ignored, not referred to, and certainly the notion of provincial status was deemed to be much more difficult to attain, if not even impossible. Fourth, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms was deemed by some to be limited by the "distinct society" clause that was offered at that point in the Meech Lake document. Fifth, the rights of French-speaking minorities outside Quebec were deemed not to be protected. There were more issues, but those seemed to be the five that seemed to be recurrent and that became, really, the focus of the discussions from 1987 to 1990.

The Meech Lake accord was also a casualty of the reality of changing of premierships across the country. In Manitoba, New Brunswick and again in Newfoundland, there had been a change in the leadership, the premiership, of those provinces, so as you know, the premiers who had signed the agreement from those provinces were no longer there and the new premiers brought with them a number of the concerns that I have outlined below. So basically the Meech Lake accord failed to be ratified by its 23 June 1990 deadline, and what began as a constitutional agenda in the late 1960s continues to be unfinished.

There are a number of other pressures that I think you will be encountering over your travels and over your consultations here in Ontario and abroad that I just want to spend a few moments with you outlining. We can have an opportunity to discuss them further, or they will become much more evident as your consultations take place. There is certainly within the country a sense of regionalism that is growing. There are many reasons for that. I am sure the people in Ontario will give you a clearer sense as to what they are, but certainly the sense of isolation from, be it the Maritimes or the western provinces, a sense of domination by central Canada, the new trading relationships that have developed with the free trade agreement, have all caused an increase in the sense of regionalism that we now observe in this country.

The social forces of the country are very much different than those that were referred to by Chris Bredt earlier when he talked about why certain responsibilities were put in the Constitution. Immigration was linked to agriculture because that reflected the colour of the immigration, it reflected the environment of the immigration. Today, the social forces within our society are very much different. The changing demographics, the rising rates of immigration in this country, and more particularly in this province, mean that the situation just is not the same as it was back in 1987.

Another important element that we would want you to remember is the forces of globalization themselves. There is an increased interdependence on international markets and that calls into question the need for various programs to either support or counterbalance that interdependence, that international marketplace. The role of the federal government or the provincial government with respect to immigration, with respect to job training, with respect to support of the industry, the role of procurement, all those

traditional, so to speak, programs and initiatives, are now being challenged because of the impact of globalization and Ontario's need to participate and to live within the new rules as they are being developed by free trade, by GATT negotiations, etc.

There is also more and more, because of the changing forces within our social fabric, an increased demand for greater protection of some of our minorities—aboriginal minorities, the multicultural minorities, women's rights and others. I would not want to list them, because I would fear to forget one or two. Certainly the whole relationship between the collective rights and the individual rights is a topic of concern, and as Chris indicated earlier, has been a major topic of discussion and concern when changing the Constitution.

1640

Just very briefly, I would like to go over with you some of the initiatives now that other provinces or other jurisdictions have undertaken. If I could beg your indulgence, I would just like to cover with you, very briefly, what seem to be some of the focuses of those other government initiatives, just so that you can either compare yours with theirs or be sensitive as to what they are looking at as opposed to what you are looking at so that you can prepare Ontario's response to somehow have some reality with what some other parts of the country are looking at. You can take notes or we can send you this material following our briefing today.

Starting from our western cousins, British Columbia has established a cabinet committee. You will also notice the various number of differences in the process itself and the membership of those processes themselves. Hence, British Columbia has developed a cabinet committee on Confederation, as it is called, and it is composed of seven cabinet ministers, including the Premier.

They basically have three areas of focus. The first one is to try to look at the practical realities of managing a federation as large as ours, with regions as diverse as ours.

The second focus is, they are looking at a restructuring of the federal system, how better to restructure the federal system, which in fact lessens the dominance of central Canada in national policymaking—so you see right at the outset this concern—and at the same time, which not only looks at how to lessen the dominance of central Canada but which also looks at reducing unnecessary duplication between the various levels of government, more particularly the federal and provincial levels. That is the second area of interest.

The third area of interest for them is basically citizen participation, looking at effective and appropriate mechanisms to ensure their citizens' participation in this process.

We do not know at the current time how the committee intends to proceed. I am checking my notes here to see when they will be reporting. We have no sense as to when they will be reporting.

Moving eastward now, the government of Alberta has set up a task force of seven government members.

Some of them are ministers. It is chaired by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr Horsman, and it includes six other government members. Over the past few months they have conducted a number of what they call round tables. They have travelled across the province and they have discussed four issues.

The first one was an overview of federalism, so they had experts. They had Ron Watts and Peter Meekison, two experts, travel to—I forget what community it was. It was a northern community. It was kind of a town hall, public meeting type of session. Both Mr Watts and Mr Meekison gave their sense of where federalism had been and where it was going. There was a discussion among the task force members, there were discussions from the floor and there was a document or report that was produced out of those discussions.

The second round table was on the dynamics of federalism. At that point, they looked at three areas in particular. They looked at aboriginal rights, and they had an Alberta aboriginal leader come to them and explain to them what aboriginal people in Alberta were looking for from federation. They had a university professor from one of the provincial universities talk about charter issues. That was the second area of interest.

The third area of interest was institutional reform. They had the executive director, I believe, of the Canada West Foundation talking about institutional reform from a western perspective. Again, there was a discussion document prepared. Your researchers will have those documents, or if not, we can make them available. They arrived last week in our offices.

The third round table was on restructuring federalism. I have not read that one yet so I do not know really what it was about. But certainly I am sure they were looking at ways and means and alternatives to the restructuring of the federation.

The fourth round table dealt with the amending process and the economics of federalism. Basically, again, they had the University of Calgary and University of Alberta professors giving their perspective as to what their thoughts were on the amending processes and on the economics of federalism. That is about the extent that I have of that information.

Those four round tables have been summarized in documents. They are now preparing—"they" meaning the task force—a discussion document which will be circulated soon across the province for some sort of consultation process. They have not, at this current time to the best of our knowledge, identified what that process will look like or what format it will take.

Basically, that discussion document should be released within the next few weeks. There will then hence be this public consultation process in the spring, and though we are anticipating some sort of report to their Legislature before the summer, no formal announcement on their reporting deadline has been made. In one way, officially, it is up in the air.

The next western province, depending if you are a CFL fan or not, which has an activity going, is Manitoba. It has put together a seven-member, all-party constitutional task

force. It is basically the same model that they used for the preparation of their constitutional position during Meech lake, so it is chaired by Professor Fox-Decent. It is then made up of a number of representatives from all the other parties. It is, again, a committee of seven made up of an all-party membership.

They are looking at six or seven specific issues. I will just go over them very briefly with you.

One is Senate reform. The second one is charter rights and implications on aboriginals and women's rights and the impact on multicultural heritage. The third area is the amending formula and amending processes for constitutional change. The fourth area they are looking at is division of powers. The fifth is, what are the overall constitutional priorities for Manitoba? The sixth area of interest for them will be to study the constitutional reform proposals from the other jurisdictions and to prepare an initial recommendation to the government of Manitoba on how Manitoba might react to those other provincial or federal proposals.

They are in a process now and they begin on 31 January, which is in the next few days, their public hearings. They will run until 9 February. They are scheduled to prepare an interim report by the end of March 1991, slightly after yours for the time being, and a final report to follow later. We are not quite sure what that means.

There is then the Bélanger-Campeau commission in Quebec. I am sure you have read a lot about it, but I just remind you that it is made up of 34 members: the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Equality Party, MNAs from each party—Liberal, Conservative and Bloc québécois MPPs—so national Liberal, national Conservative and national Bloc québécois MPs, representatives of business, labour, arts, culture, anglophones, allophones and youth groups are members of the committee.

As you know, the committee's mandate is to examine and analyse the political and constitutional status of Quebec and to make recommendations on that. They have held already a number of public hearings across the province. They began in November and they went on until 18 January. A special forum for the youth was convened 22 January to 23 January.

The commission up until now has heard submissions from about 260 individuals or groups. They also invited 109 experts some time in November from various fields—law, sociology, economics, political science, etc—to submit their reaction to a series of questions. There were eight questions that they wished to have some input from the experts. Out of those 109 experts, 53 experts submitted answers, and of those 53, 27 of them were invited to appear before the committee. I think it is fair to say that a majority of the submissions before the commission has advocated some sort of sovereignty.

1650

The final provincial jurisdiction to have announced an initiative is the province of New Brunswick. They have appointed a nine-person commission on Canadian federalism. It is basically composed of MLAs and of representatives from business, academic, native and francophone

communities and it basically seem to have two areas of particular attention. One is to make recommendations on how the federation can be strengthened. The other is to examine the current state of the federation and to make recommendations on its renewal. So there is strengthening the federation and recommendations on renewal of the federation.

In addition, the commission has been asked and invited to reflect very specifically on New Brunswick's two official linguistic communities and aboriginal communities as important elements that will strengthen the province in the national federation.

We understand that the commission is now currently in the process of writing a discussion document which it hopes to release very soon. It will then be the focus of a series of discussion groups throughout the province.

An interim report is tentatively scheduled for December 1991, though in my discussions with my colleagues there is a sensitivity to the deadlines from all the other provinces and other jurisdictions and it will be the subject of ongoing discussions within their own task force, but as initially invited and announced by the Premier of that province last fall, they are tentatively scheduled right now to produce an interim by December 1991 with a final report scheduled for July 1992.

There are two or three other initiatives which I would just simply like to remind you of. It will probably simply remind you of the fact that you are not the only jurisdiction either in Ontario or in the country studying this area. There is the Spicer commission that you have all heard of, I am sure, with 12 members. They seem to have three objectives.

The first is to develop a consensus on shared values within the country, looking at what are the common interests. The second is to solicit views on bilingualism, regionalism, multiculturalism, aboriginal peoples' place in the federation and external pressures on Canada in the future. That is basically a summary of the type of questions that they have been circulating and asking people. The third is to get Canadians in all walks of life to talk to each other, to discuss this matter among themselves.

The commission's work has been divided into what we call four phases. Are these ours or theirs?

Mr Sadlier-Brown: Theirs.

Mr Obonsawin: Theirs, okay, great.

The first phase is—using some of the words; this is reminiscent of some of the things we might say—the briefing sessions to try to get a sense of how Canadians want to express their opinions. They have been going around to opinion leaders and to various focus groups and trying to get a sense of how to solicit that input. The second phase is called the ventilation phase, which will allow Canadians to let off steam. That is why I was wondering if those were our words or their words. The third phase is the dialogue phase, which is there to encourage Canadians to try to find some sort of approach, some sort of constructive solution to the unity question. The fourth phase is called the focus phase, which tries to really deduce trends and which will culminate in the completion of their report.

In addition to that federal initiative, there is another one, potentially a more technical one, I suppose, which is a special joint Senate and House of Commons committee on the amending formula. It was announced in early December and basically has one focus, that is, to look at how to improve the process of amending the Constitution. It is also to report, as I may have omitted to indicate earlier, at the same time as the Spicer committee, which is again on 1 July 1991.

The committee is headed by Jim Edwards, an MPP from Edmonton, and Senator G rald Beaudoin as co-chairs. They have not, to the best of our knowledge, finalized their process and have not given a sense of how they plan to entail. We only received very recently a list of their members, and even that I notice is still incomplete, but we certainly have it if people would like to know who the members are. It is very long.

In the private sector there are also a number of other initiatives happening. The editor of the *Financial Post*, Mr Godfrey, has made it public for some time that he feels there needs to be a non-governmental dialogue in this nature. I do not really want to scoop him or give you a sense as to what he would like to announce, but simply to say that during the spring and summer one can expect the *Financial Post* to be certainly involved in the debate.

We understand that there may be some supplements which would cover subjects such as aboriginals, regional development, collective versus individual rights, international competitiveness, and where do we go from here? Those at the current time seem to be the areas of interest for that activity, and it is being led by a non-profit organization which is trying now to raise the funding to be able to do that. There is seemingly some interest from at least one national television channel, one national television chain, to have some national discussions around those supplements that would be printed in the *Financial Post*.

There is also the Business Council on National Issues, the BCNI, as it is known for short. They have held a number of workshops or symposiums lately to try to get the business community focusing in on the issues. They had a symposium on 16 January where 13 papers from major academics and practitioners from across the country were presented, again outlining for the business people what were some of the choices, what were some of the issues. It is our understanding that they plan on trying to come together some time in February or March with a position which would potentially represent BCNI's official position and with which they would be attempting to influence the other forums that are doing what you are doing across the country.

We know that the Canadian Association for Business Economics, the C. D. Howe Institute and I am sure a number of other institutes are getting together under various processes and forums to talk about the issue and to be active in soliciting their views to this select committee and to the other committees that are travelling across the country.

The Chair: Thank you very much for that overview. Are there any questions on the part of the committee members?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You did not mention another group that seemed to have sprung forward last week, and I just wondered if they have actually got any status. I am talking about the networking group at the University of Ottawa that seemed to have a very interesting project. I do not even know what the membership is, but could you say a little bit about that?

Mr Obonsawin: I only read that when I was in Quebec City, Gordon Robertson's group, and I know that a discussion of that came out of one of the sessions that was held in McGill last fall. There simply was a bit of a frustration from a lot of the people who were working on all those areas. They really did not know who was doing what, what the terms of reference were for everyone, who was going to be finishing first, second and third. At that point in time, hence about eight months ago, the idea was to simply have a central information repository, a place—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Data gathering.

Mr Obonsawin: That is right, a place that would have a bit of a pulse as to what was happening nationally. I do not know if that is what Mr Robertson has taken up and is going with. Peter, do you know?

Mr Sadlier-Brown: No.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: He is talking about volunteers, it seems, and this seems like a monumental job for volunteers. Could you get us an update on what is going on up there? I would appreciate that.

Mr Obonsawin: We will.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I have one other question. In the Alberta situation, are we still sticking with government members only?

Mr Obonsawin: To the best of my knowledge, they are.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Even in their public consultation?

Mr Obonsawin: The task force members are government only. As to the people who attend, that is open.

1700

Mr Beer: I wonder if you might just set out for us as well—I believe the Quebec Liberal Party will be submitting its report, given that it is the government that is going to have some fairly heavy play—if you would, for our benefit and also for those viewing, tell us what their time lines are.

Second, in the process that Chris was speaking to around the amending formula, could you tell us a little bit more about how section 43 would work in terms of the federal government coming to an understanding with a province? I know that immigration powers have been discussed and came out of Meech, that this would be perhaps one place where in effect there could be an agreement. What kinds of agreements have been reached under that that we might look at as examples and what sense do you have as to how seriously the federal government is looking

at that route as one way to at least get around some problems of trying to get unanimity or even 7-50?

Mr Obonsawin: I will deal with the first one right away, just with maybe key dates in the province of Quebec. There was, as you know, the Parti québécois conference this weekend, at which point they developed a series of approaches as to how they would deal with their election and a referendum which they are calling for.

We understand that tomorrow the Liberal Party of Quebec will be issuing what is termed in the business to be the Allaire report, which is the recommendation from its constitutional committee to the Liberal Party.

Mr Beer: Could I just interrupt briefly? Your understanding is that will be tomorrow, not next week, but tomorrow?

Mr Obonsawin: That is right.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So they have speeded it up.

Mr Obonsawin: It has never been clear in our minds when it was. So it would be tomorrow. I just want you to realize what it is. It is their constitutional committee's recommendation to their party. Their party will then get together on 8, 9 and 10 March, and at the conference the recommendations of the Allaire report will be put before the membership and the membership will then vote for what the Liberal Party stand will be. To go any further, one simply gets into speculation. The government will then have to decide what it wishes to do.

The other key date is 28 March, which is the Bélanger-Campeau committee report.

Now for the easy one.

Mr Bredt: This one is not as easy as one would think.

Mr Beer: You made it sound so easy, I thought.

Mr Bredt: It is difficult to give the members of this committee a definitive interpretation of section 43 because it has never been used before. The only time that it was thought to be used was during the Meech process when New Brunswick came forward with its proposal to entrench its language legislation. The thought was that that could be simply done bilaterally by the federal government and by the province.

I think it is important, when you look at the actual wording of section 43, that there are two alternative approaches that might be taken to it. The first approach is that it would apply only to provisions that are currently in existence that are unique to one or more provinces, and there are a number of provisions like that. For example, section 133 of the Constitution applies only to Quebec; certain provisions of the charter apply only to New Brunswick. So this first and more narrow interpretation would say that section 43 is limited to provisions already in existence, or similar provisions, to change them simply bilaterally or trilaterally, depending upon the number of provinces that are involved.

An alternative interpretation and a broader interpretation would be that it could be used for any bilateral amendment. The reason for the ambiguity is because the language of section 43 itself is somewhat ambiguous. It says, "An amendment to the Constitution of Canada in

relation to any provision that applies to one or more but not all provinces," and then suggests things like boundaries or amendments to provisions dealing with the French and English languages.

This second, broader interpretation could be applied to an area like, for example, immigration. Immigration is currently a provision that applies equally to all provinces under section 95. There is concurrent jurisdiction between the federal government and the provincial government with the federal government's legislation being paramount, so that currently to the extent there is a conflict between federal legislation and provincial initiatives, the federal legislation would prevail over the provincial legislation.

Under a broader interpretation then, an amendment could be made to the provision to create special provisions with respect to one province or the other. Because there has not been any interpretation, it is unclear whether the narrower interpretation is applicable or the broader one, although it is our view that the narrower interpretation is more likely to be accepted by the courts.

Mr Beer: Just a short supplementary from your last statement then. One of the suggestions has been that, on the so-called area of language, culture, communications and immigration, would this be a vehicle by which the federal government could, if it wanted, come to an understanding with Quebec on the powers in those areas? Is it your sense that that would probably not be likely?

Mr Bredt: I think the fairest answer is that you would have to look at it on a case-by-case approach. With respect to language, for example, section 133 clearly applies only to Quebec. So an amendment to that provision could be agreed to bilaterally between the federal government and the provincial government, because that is a particular provision currently in existence that applies specially to one province.

As you move to other areas, immigration being an alternative example, then you would have to get into this legal question as to the broader interpretation versus the more narrow interpretation.

Mr Malkowski: You talked a little bit about the provinces in Canada and the Constitution. I am wondering about the national committee that is looking after native affairs. Are there any plans to consult and bring native people more into the picture? Could you clarify that?

Mr Obonsawin: To the best of my knowledge, the short answer is no. My reading of the situation is that there has been a bit of confusion about the role of the so-called Spicer commission with respect to the native issue. The Prime Minister has asked Mr Spicer to have special consideration for the aboriginal questions and certainly that is part of the general terms of reference. But at one point in time Mr Spicer had been asked to develop a different and a dedicated process for dealing with aboriginal issues and that does not seem to be happening.

I suppose the other area of action by the federal government is that it has deemed to deal with a number of aboriginal issues, in its mind, through enhanc-

ing a number of its programs. Ministries like Health and Welfare Canada and Indian Affairs have been asked to do some fast-tracking and to do more intense negotiations, certainly on the notion of land claims. The Minister of Indian Affairs has received support from cabinet to hasten the discussions of the land claims.

But again, just to summarize, as far as the consultation process is concerned, it is integrated with the Spicer commission and does not appear at this point in time to be getting a special dedicated process attached to it.

Mr Malkowski: Could you then just update us with some information about what movement is going to be happening and what is going to be happening with our own standing committee, if we are going to be hearing anything from aboriginals?

The Chair: That is obviously something that we will have to take a look at. I think, as you know, we are trying to ensure that through our outreach people we do make contact with people in the various constituencies, and certainly particularly among those would be the native communities. Mrs O'Neill?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Beer asked the question I was going to ask.

1710

Ms Churley: You mentioned five major issues that were part of the problem with Meech. I realize there were more, but you did not mention women's rights. My understanding is that there were a number of women's groups across the country with some real concerns, and I am wondering if you could address that briefly and give us a little bit of background around those particular issues.

Mr Obonsawin: First of all, I apologize for not mentioning it. They are certainly in my notes, and as I was reading too quickly I omitted it, but that was certainly an area of interest. Could I ask you to comment a little bit about the interest on women's issues, especially with respect to some of the constitutional articles that were being referred to in that discussion?

Mr Bredt: Sure. I think the prime area of concern centred on the impact of the "distinct society" clause. The "distinct society" clause gave the Quebec government the power to preserve and promote Quebec's distinct nature. The last part of the Meech Lake accord made clear that aboriginal rights and multicultural rights would not be affected by the "distinct society" clause. I think the concern among the women's groups was that, because of the absence of a reference to the provision in the charter protecting equality for both men and women in that last clause, women's rights might be adversely affected by the "distinct society" clause.

Ms Churley: I have one other question, unrelated. What is the Canada West Foundation? Perhaps I should know this, but I am just curious because it was mentioned as part of the Alberta—

Mr Obonsawin: You can tell by the smiles on our faces that we are not quite sure what it is except that it is a foundation that is certainly very interested in promoting

western values and the western point of view within a number of political discussions.

Ms Churley: So it is primarily a political advocacy—

Mr Obonsawin: I do not think it is a registered political party. It would probably be incorporated under an organizational—what would you call those, charitable organizations? That is a good question, actually. I do not think we have ever investigated the actual standing of the party, Dr. you do know?

Dr Careless: Yes, I just have a bit of information. The Canada West Foundation goes back quite some number of years. It goes back to about 1981. It is a group that I think started at the University of Calgary. It is an academically based group that then was supported by a number of people in the private sector and remained that way, basically a private sector group. They do not take a position that supports one party or another, but if you are asking where there is a political expression of their interests, I think their greatest impact probably has been, number one, that the Reform Party of the west, although it calls itself the Reform Party of Canada, would have picked up many of the ideas. In particular, the idea they are most interested in, that Canada West would have done most of the research on, is the issue of Senate reform. The phrase "triple E," elected, equal and effective, was an idea that in some fashion sprang out of the Canada West Foundation research.

Some of the work that has been done by the government of Alberta, when it brought forward a number of its proposals in the last round of constitutional discussions, would equally have been affected by the research that had been done by the Canada West Foundation.

Mr Beer: One of the things that is very different in a sense in this committee, from our work three years ago, is that at that time there was a specific document we were looking at, and groups and individuals could respond to that, as could we as members of the committee. Here we have a broader mandate and in point of fact some of it is in a sense dealing with, I suppose, elements that are not constitutional in any legal sense, but rather we are trying to get a sense of where Ontarians are and how we feel and think about our country.

None the less, with the focus in this case particularly on Ontario and what our place is in Confederation, and looking at what is going on in the other provinces, not just Quebec but certainly in the western provinces, I am wondering, in terms of the sort of research, the kind of information we are going to need, I suppose, around different scenarios and what are the consequences of some of those scenarios for the province economically, socially, culturally—in a number of areas—are there some major research projects we could tap into that you are aware of that are ongoing through any of the major universities or business organizations or indeed that perhaps the province or the federal government may be undertaking?

At some point down the line, I would think we need to have a better sense of what some of the different scenarios are going to mean for this province, because some of those are extreme, whether coming out of Quebec or out of different parts of the west. I think this becomes much more

important in a sense for this committee than perhaps it was previously. You may have some of the answers to that, but I think it would be very helpful to the committee if there were other things that you needed to go away and look up. What are the things that are ongoing and what are the things that we should perhaps be trying to focus on as we go through, not just in our February trip but really the longer route through to the end of June?

Mr Obonsawin: Tone, have you got any—Tone is always plugged into that area.

Dr Careless: I might help with the first half of the question and not perhaps say too much about the second half.

The deputy minister mentioned in his presentation that there are two large private sector organizations that in Ontario have had conferences or symposia. One is the C. D. Howe Institute located in Toronto and the other one is the Business Council on National Issues and they recently held symposia in Toronto.

The input into those two symposia is very extensive. Primarily at this point it has come from the academic community and therefore the groups who have been active previously, the interest groups we have been talking about, have not explicitly been asked to make an input. But if I might suggest, either an examination of the work they have already done or a consultation with their research directors I think would give you a very good overview of the work that has been covered.

I know that the Business Council on National Issues, for example, under the work of Ron Watts that we mentioned, has a number of pieces of material that are now publicly available for consideration. I know also that the C. D. Howe Institute is intending to bring out in the next month or so the result of its symposia. I think an examination of the table of contents would give a sense of the breadth with which the academic community has approached this particular issue this time around.

The Chair: I would just add to that, Mr Beer, that just on one of those two pieces, I in fact spoke with Mr Watts early this afternoon and he did comment exactly about the series of papers that was presented at the conference, I guess it was just in the middle of January, through the Business Council on National Issues. Those papers are on their way to my office and I will distribute them to the members of this committee. I was going to raise that later on, but your question was right on that point.

Mr Beer: Can I just ask one last part on this? The Bélanger-Campeau commission has prepared a number of papers. It seems to me there were some on the economic side. Are there some there that are in the public domain and would be useful for us to look at?

Ms Barry: I think perhaps I will answer that question. The commission invited 27 experts to make oral presentations to it, and in fact we do have copies of several of these submissions and many of them are economic. So perhaps what we can do is make those available to you.

Mr Beer: Was there documentation behind those submissions? I am looking as well for perhaps where somebody made a submission but where in fact there is some

pretty extensive research that has been done on that particular issue. Is that available?

Ms Barry: As far as I know, what the experts were asked to do was to respond to eight written questions. A lot of those questions did not really get into the economics in great depth, but what we can do is take a look at what we have, and in addition to that we can contact the commission and see what else we can get for you.

1720

Mr Obonsawin: I think in a general sense what you might want to do, Mr Chairman, is simply get your research staff together with some of our people. The University of Toronto, the University of Saskatchewan, there are a number of universities and other forums that are in the process of organizing events and preparing papers. So we would keep you abreast as to what is happening and give you copies of what is out there in the public domain.

Mr Beer: I think we do not want to reinvent the wheel.

Mr Obonsawin: That is right.

Mr Beer: The tendency is to get everybody doing what perhaps has already been done and let's take advantage of that.

Mr Obonsawin: Yes.

Mr Harnick: Are you in a position to provide us with a detailed summary of the objectives of each of the other commissions and some of the questions that they have been asking?

Mr Obonsawin: Certainly I can give you what I outlined today in writing, and then we can certainly have the people who have been monitoring some of these more closely give you a broader sense of what the discussion has been.

Mr Harnick: We see the 14 questions that the Spicer commission is concerned with. What I would like to see is what the thrust of some of the provincial commissions is.

Mr Obonsawin: I think this is why maybe we should be working with some of your research people. The Alberta situation produced four reports which basically are a summary of the discussion that evening. We could give you that, or we could work with your own counsels to provide summaries of that. Why do we not make an agreement that we will get some of that going?

Mr Harnick: Could some of that be available to us before we start seeing witnesses?

Mr Obonsawin: Okay.

The Chair: I think on each of those we will have to have our people talk with you, as you said, Mr Obonsawin, sift out what would be of use to us and put that in some kind of summary form for the members of the committee.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope they will be executive summaries.

The Chair: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I want to verify, the Spicer people have abandoned their questions, correct? What are they doing with all those kits they threw around?

Mr Obonsawin: I read that in the paper too. Do you have an update on that, Peter?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: They found them too confining and people were not speaking to them. Does anybody know the status of what is happening to those?

Mr Sadlier-Brown: My understanding is that they are in the process of revising the questions to make them more accessible than they were. I think they were designed largely for the purpose of compilation and other sort of commission-oriented objectives rather than making easy questions for the public to deal with. They have had some difficulty with them.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Kind observation. I would like to ask you about the Business Council on National Issues. This has been a concern of mine for a long time, like five years. In the discussions right from 1982, I guess, if I want to go back that far, we very seldom heard real business people speaking to this issue at all—I am very pleased, I did not know the Financial Post was going to put out supplements—and now you say that the Business Council on National Issues will take part. I think you reported the papers presented were mostly from academic people, whom I respect highly.

I wanted to ask you if you know anything about who attended. I guess what I am worried about, and I have certainly not kept it as any secret that I am concerned, and even within my own community, is that the Kiwanis, the chamber of commerce, the board of trade—let's face it, the community that I come from is in very close proximity to economic interdependence of our two provinces.

I guess I am asking you if any of these kinds of people attend to listen to these papers, or do you know that? I just wonder if you can help me to allay some of my fears. This country was founded on economic ties, and I know you mentioned the free trade agreement as being one of the difficulties that now seem to be changing the focus of our discussions. Do you understand my concern? Maybe you can help me through it a little.

Mr Obonsawin: Certainly there was a good representation of business people. Tone has been kind of following these other activities and he may be able to give us better details of that.

Dr Careless: Yes. I hope I have not misled you here. The symposium that I referred to was one in which the entire council—I think there must be 150 members in some capacity on that council—asked academics to prepare for a couple of months on a number of topics. Although I was not in attendance at the meeting, what I read in the newspaper was that the council then, after hearing this presentation for two days, struck task forces of its own members in order to go back and come forward with a series of recommendations to their council. So it seemed to me that the academics were asked to—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am sorry, I do not know the makeup of this council. They are actually members of the business community in leadership roles in their own communities?

Dr Careless: That is right, CEOs. That is correct.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That is a little bit of a comfort.

Mr Obonsawin: What we could do is just give you an indication of who the memberships of the BCNI are and we might even talk to the organizers of BCNI just to see to what extent we could release some of that information.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I do hope that we will get members of the business community coming forward.

Mr Obonsawin: Certainly it is our understanding that BCNI is very quickly at work in February so that it will be able to put forth its position that it hopes to have before forums such as this.

Mr Winninger: Given the bewildering array of committees like our own studying the future of Confederation across Canada, and given the absence of any firm dates for first ministers' conferences, how do you see the machinery evolving to resolve what will probably be many diverse viewpoints on the future of Confederation, both from the provincial committees and nationally?

Mr Obonsawin: How long do I have?

Mr Winninger: I know it smacks of crystal-ball gazing, but I am just wondering how our Intergovernmental Affairs ministry is going to come to grips with this situation of many committees operating simultaneously.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: One day at a time.

Mr Obonsawin: One day at a time. Actually, that is truly the answer. The question you are asking is the \$64,000 question: I guess it is the \$64-million question now. The current difficulty we have with Quebec's position of not wanting at the current time to engage in multi-lateral discussions, the fact that the first ministers have not agreed to a future first ministers' conference and the fact that the various jurisdictions are busily working at the constitutional issues and also some of their own other priorities all make this a very difficult point to crystal-ball with.

Chris has a point to make, but before I turn it over to him, obviously at the current time—and I do not know what is going to change—certainly with the déclenchement of whatever happens in Quebec, I think that will probably start as a focus of the discussion and then it becomes a question of the process.

There are a number of reports that are going to be presented, one of them, as we talked about earlier, the Beaudoin report looking at processes of amendment. Maybe they will come up with something that people are interested in. Maybe this committee may come up with an idea or two on future processes and how to get people around the table; maybe another jurisdiction will. But it is just not enough to define what the various interests and problems are. One also has to be very sensitive to how it is all going to come together.

There is another answer here which may be even better.

Mr Bredt: I doubt that, but I will just toss in a few bons mots. I think, in terms of helping this committee come to grips with that issue, because that is going to be one of the critical issues that the country is going to have to grapple with, first, there has been a federal discussion paper that has been looking at the amending formula wherein they have discussed at least some of these issues;

and second, some of the papers that we have agreed to provide to you look at the process issue and look at solutions to it through things like constituent assemblies and so forth. I guess I would urge this committee to read some of those papers and reports.

Mr Obonsawin: Tone Careless has been with the government I think basically through most of these discussions.

Dr Careless: Since 1867.

Mr Obonsawin: Since 1867, so Tone Careless is a very precious member of the government when it comes to these questions.

Dr Careless: I was not going to give anything quite as impressive as a response. I was just going to pick up on your question and say that in addition to the sources that Chris has mentioned, there are a number of people in this collection of academics I have referred to who have particularly looked at this. I am thinking of Professor Peter Russell at the University of Toronto, for example. You may find that there are some good resources there who have given quite a bit of thought to how we could somehow get out of the process in which bureaucrats and élites rearrange the country. There may be other ideas that they could bring forward to you.

1730

Mr Obonsawin: I think that as you are able to go over some of my comments when they are in written form, you will also see that a lot of the other provinces in fact are looking at that, so it becomes part of the dialogue.

The Chair: I have no one else on the list. Are there any other questions? Mr Obonsawin and his staff I think have agreed to remain with us for a little while so that when we finish the public session, if there are any comments or further discussion informally, that could also happen afterwards. Thank you very much for the presentation.

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICE

The Chair: We will proceed now to a briefing from the legislative research staff, Philip Kaye.

Mr Kaye: I have been asked to briefly review the reports of the last two constitutional committees of the Legislature. The first report is by the select committee on constitutional reform, which was created in November 1987 and was chaired by Mr Beer. The other committee is the select committee on constitutional and intergovernmental affairs which was established in December 1989 and was chaired by Mr Furlong.

The first committee was struck to consider the Meech Lake accord and reported in June 1988. At the beginning of the report, members stated that as legislators they were faced with two major considerations. The first consideration was the process of ratifying the Meech Lake accord and the consequences of that process. The second consideration was the relationship of Canada, Quebec and the Constitution.

With respect to the ratification process, the committee noted that the accord had to be passed in the same form by each provincial Legislature and Parliament in order to become part of the Constitution, and it had to be passed by

23 June 1990. If there were any amendments before then, then the ratification process would have to start all over again.

To quote from the report: "We declare in the most emphatic terms that it is very difficult for provincial legislators and the people they represent to perform their proper function of helping the nation achieve an agreeable resolution of constitutional debate when confronted by a virtual *fait accompli* of first ministers." The report continued, "It is surely crucial for the health of contemporary Canadian parliamentary democracy that the people and their elected representatives be an integral part of the process of constitutional change."

With respect to the place of Quebec in the Constitution, the report stated that Quebec's refusal to accept the terms of the 1982 Constitution Act meant that "Canada's second-largest province and home to the vast majority of its French-speaking citizens was isolated," that it was "outside the mainstream of Canadian constitutional life." The committee felt that this was "clearly an unacceptable and dangerous situation, and one that demanded redress." The report went on to say that without Quebec's presence at the table, no meaningful national progress could be expected on such areas as multicultural, aboriginal, territorial and equality rights.

Part II of the report contains an outline of the testimony before the committee. The issue which attracted the most attention of witnesses and which was mentioned by Mr Bredt earlier was the relationship between clause 1, which dealt with fundamental characteristics of Canada and the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society, and clause 16, which held that the existing rights pertaining to aboriginal peoples and multiculturalism was not affected by anything in clause 1.

A concern expressed to the committee was that clause 1 would be completely dominant over the charter. For instance, it was argued that any legislation enacted by Quebec to promote the distinct character of its society might fall outside the charter.

The committee said that this question of whether, and if so, to what extent charter rights would be affected by clauses 1 and 16 of the accord was the most difficult issue it had to deal with. It concluded that the clauses very likely did not pose a threat to charter rights. However, it recommended that following the ratification of the Meech Lake accord, the Legislature should consider three additions to the list of fundamental characteristics of Canada. These three additions would recognize aboriginal peoples, Canada's multicultural heritage and the commitment to the protection of the rights and freedoms of all Canadians as fundamental characteristics of Canada.

The Progressive Conservative minority opinion of Mr. Eves and Mr. Harris was devoted to the charter issue. They supported the recommendations contained in the majority report but felt they did not go far enough. They had proposed unsuccessfully to the committee that it recommend a court reference on whether the accord would affect charter rights, and if so, how? They wrote that if the government continued to oppose such a reference, the Legislature should adopt specific companion resolutions on aboriginal

rights and multiculturalism which removed some of the legal concerns.

The final section of the report contains 11 recommendations. In recommending that the Legislature ratify the accord, the committee acknowledged the accord was not perfect. However, the committee believed the accord accomplished two important objectives: first, it brought Quebec back into the Constitution as a full partner which the committee described as a major achievement; second, the committee felt that the accord resolved a number of long-standing disputes in federal-provincial relations.

The other recommendations in the report dealt with future constitutional rounds. One of the recommendations I have already mentioned, the one dealing with the fundamental characteristics of Canada. Just to highlight a few of the other recommendations, one focused on the process by which the accord was reached. The committee referred to a widespread feeling that the public and various legislatures should be more actively involved in both the generation and ratification of constitutional agreements. It considered it essential that legislatures be informed of, and open to public debate. Accordingly, it recommended that the Legislature establish a standing constitutional committee.

Another recommendation held that future first ministers' conferences on the Constitution should deal with multiculturalism, the charter and equality rights, aboriginal rights, minority language rights and the Constitutional status of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. The committee also wanted to see constitutional conferences specifically devoted to aboriginal rights.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, the next constitutional committee was the select committee on constitutional and intergovernmental affairs which was set up in December 1989. Its terms of reference said that in anticipation of a first ministers' conference on Senate reform, which was tentatively scheduled for November of last year, the committee would conduct hearings on Senate reform and, subject to the proclamation of the Meech Lake accord by 23 June of last year, it would continue its hearings and table a report in the Legislature by 15 October 1990.

The Prime Minister had said that there would be a first ministers' conference on Senate reform only after Meech Lake had been approved. Meech Lake died and that committee did not present any kind of report. It did conduct hearings on Senate reform last February, April and May in Toronto and Ottawa. These hearings were designed to give members background information on the complexities of Senate reform. Accordingly the witnesses were principally senators and academics.

The next phase, had these hearings continued, would have encouraged submissions from the public. Most witnesses appearing before the committee spoke not only about how senators should be selected, who should be represented in the Senate and on what basis and what powers the Senate should have; they also dealt with other issues such as the role of parties in a reformed Senate.

1740

Thus some of the questions raised before the committee were, for example, was it naïve to contemplate a reformed Senate of independent senators? If so, how could the role of parties be minimized? Alternatively it was asked whether or not the objective should be the accommodation rather than the bypassing of parties; in other words, the strengthening of parties and the bringing of appropriate regional views into them. Most witnesses also stressed to the committee that reform had to be considered in the context of Canada's entire system of government.

The committee put Senate reform aside at the beginning of last June when the companion agreement to the Meech Lake accord, which is formally known as the 1990 Constitutional Agreement, was referred to it. This report is divided into two parts. The first part reproduces the constitutional agreement with explanatory notes and the second part reviews the testimony of witnesses and contains the committee's five recommendations.

The committee's first recommendation dealt with the process of amending the Constitution. The committee referred, with approval, to the conclusions on process that the previous constitutional committee on Meech Lake had reached, that the public and the legislatures had to be more actively involved.

Similar to the previous committee, it recommended the establishment of a standing committee on the Constitution and furthermore that the first item on the agenda of this new constitutional committee be "the development of a model process for Ontario for the consideration of constitutional amendments in Ontario."

With respect to Senate reform, the committee welcomed the concept of a national commission on Senate reform as one way of providing for significant public input. Then it outlined in the report some of the concerns of witnesses regarding membership on the commission and the principles that would guide it.

The committee noted that the Ontario commitment regarding Senate seats whereby there might be a redistribution of Senate seats in July 1995 helped to achieve a consensus when the first ministers' conference was on the verge of breaking down. It recommended that the province remain committed to meaningful Senate reform.

The committee next recommended that the province continue its efforts to address aboriginal concerns. In reviewing the testimony of aboriginal groups, the committee wrote: "In support of the Manitoba chiefs some native presenters stated that their people had nothing to lose. When committee members reflected on that observation, the enormity of the present situation in our nation was borne upon us. The stand of the chiefs of Manitoba tells us more: The credit of Canadian governments and politicians of European extraction has run out among native people and the tactics of occasional indulgence would appear to be at an end."

At the same time, however, the committee expressed concerns over aspects of the aboriginal strategy, pointing out, for example, that it differed from positions taken by native presenters before the previous committee.

On the concept of a Canada clause that would recognize fundamental characteristics of Canada, the committee reaffirmed the recommendation of the previous constitutional committee. It wished to see multicultural heritages, aboriginal rights and gender equality rights named in the charter and a companion resolution on fundamental characteristics of Canada.

In its conclusion the committee recommended that the Legislature ratify the 1990 Constitutional Agreement.

A dissenting opinion was submitted by Mr Wildman. He felt that the limited time the committee had to operate, from 11 June to 20 June, made it impossible to complete a comprehensive hearing process. He recommended that the assembly not approve the agreement until after the committee had carried out comprehensive public hearings across Ontario. He further recommended that the assembly call for an extension of the Meech Lake deadline beyond 23 June of last year to allow time for the concerns of aboriginal peoples to be properly dealt with.

After Meech Lake died, the constitutional committee's terms of reference were changed. Instead of looking at Senate reform, it was to look at the process of amending the Constitution, which is very similar to what the joint committee in Ottawa has been established to do. However, the committee did not hold any hearings on process as the provincial election intervened. So this is the next constitutional committee.

The Chair: Are there any questions of Mr Kaye? No? Thanks very much.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair: The next item on the agenda is a report from the subcommittee. I guess I should say before I read this out that this is a summary of some of the decisions we have made, but there are obviously a number of things that we are continuing to look at through the subcommittee. One major area is the one Mr Beer has touched on earlier in his question around the issue of possible research or looking into work that is being done in the academic sector. But in terms of some of the decisions that we have made to date:

"The business subcommittee met on January 15, 16 and 23 to discuss the committee's agenda and hiring of consultants to assist the committee.

"The subcommittee agreed to the travel schedule and that this schedule was sent to all members of the committee as soon as possible." That has obviously been done.

"The subcommittee agreed that, if the committee is unable to appear at any location due to inclement weather, the committee will not try to reschedule the community affected during the February schedule but would try and reschedule the meeting during the spring session." We all recognized that the time was a problem for us.

"The subcommittee agreed that Alpha Consultants Inc should be retained to assist the committee by providing an outreach program.

"The subcommittee agreed that the Chair and the clerk should proceed to hire a firm to handle media relations. Following these instructions, the firm of Media Concepts Communications Inc has been retained.

"The subcommittee approved the advertising presented by the clerk and to the proposal for distribution to the media.

"The subcommittee agreed that a 1-800 number should be used to assist in providing information to the public and to take their comments. It was agreed that the most effective way to handle this number was to contract a firm. The firm of S & P Data Corp has been contracted on behalf of the committee. This number will be in service until 30 June 1991.

"The subcommittee discussed the presentations to the committees. Individuals will be told that they have 15 minutes to make their presentations. The time for groups will be 20 to 30 minutes.

"Also, as Chair, I have instructed the clerk to place advertisements in the Wawatey newspaper. These ads will be run in several native languages. I have also agreed that the committee will host a banquet in Sioux Lookout. The committee will have a chance"—through this occasion—"to meet with students and local citizens who may not have had a chance to attend the formal meetings." That is also another way, we felt, of giving us an opportunity to talk to some of the members of that community.

Are there any questions or comments on that? I think a number of these are issues that may be familiar already.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think I have discussed it very informally with you, and I know that you have followed the discussion we had with action, but I did not hear you again today mention that on the 1-800 number people would be well informed that they could request a copy of the discussion paper.

The Chair: Yes, absolutely. Thanks for reminding me again. That has been arranged and in fact the mechanism for sorting that out is being worked out between the clerk's office and the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The general public will have knowledge of that?

The Chair: Yes, and in fact the 1-800 number will certainly also be part of the discussion paper itself that will be released tomorrow. Through the parliamentary channel, and I believe through the cable companies and obviously through the advertisement that we will be doing, that will also be part of the information that will indicate that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I wondered, do we have a distribution list that we are going to begin with on the discussion paper?

The Chair: The distribution list for the discussion paper, as I understand it, totals something like 80,000 groups or organizations. It is all of the groups that are on mailing lists in any of the ministries of the government.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Did you say 8,000 or 80,000?

The Chair: Eighty. Mr Obonsawin could correct me if I am wrong.

Mr Obonsawin: Yes, close to 80,000 initially.

The Chair: That is just the initial list and there may be others that will get added to that as time goes on.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Are we sending it to places like public libraries and university libraries?

The Chair: Yes. I see nodding at the back. I know that, for example, one of the concerns that was expressed earlier was that there be copies available in the members' constituency offices and that will be done. I think there is also going to be an attempt to get it out to as many public places as possible.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: At the moment, in two languages?

The Chair: The document will come out, as government documents do, in the two languages, English and French. In addition to that, there will be a summary of the paper available in, I gather, about seven or eight additional languages; perhaps not that many, but a number of other additional languages.

1750

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think it would be helpful if we knew the languages as soon as possible, as many of us have communities—

The Chair: What I have asked is that some copies in those languages be also made available at least to the members, and then they could be distributed. Again, that is part of what is being sorted out.

Mr Malkowski: About the interpreters and the language issue. It has marked down here "two." I had requested four.

The Chair: You are dealing with the budget. Let's deal with that when we get to it, okay?

Is there anything else on the subcommittee report? Then I think under our rules this is deemed to have been approved. No, we require a motion to approve it, I believe.

Mr Malkowski: Just before we accept this, you need to cover the cost of the interpreters. I want to make sure; I want four, not two.

The Chair: Sorry. We are only dealing with the subcommittee report. The budget is the next item on the agenda. We are not approving the budget yet.

Mr Malkowski: But I do not want this approved. I want to make sure that we solve the issue of the interpreters first, because it will affect the budget.

The Chair: It is part of the budget discussion is what I am suggesting. That is on the next item. But as you have raised it, my understanding was that it had been sorted out. Could we just leave that as an item to be dealt with under the budget, which is where it appears as an item?

The languages, I have been told, in which the summary will be available are Italian, Greek, Spanish, Chinese and Portuguese.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: When did you say they will be available?

The Chair: I do not have an exact date. I think they are trying to have that ready some time this week, but that was just the best guess people could make earlier today.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: How will we get them? Should we send in a request?

The Chair: I think we can ensure that at least some copies are sent out to all members of the committee and in fact to all members of the Legislature. I do not think that is too difficult to do.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That would be very helpful. If we could have even one copy, we could copy.

Ms Churley: When you say Chinese, I assume you mean Cantonese.

The Chair: As I saw that, Ms Churley, that question came to my mind as well. That is something we will have to pass on. I presume the people in Intergovernmental Affairs are conscious of that.

Ms Churley: It is an issue.

The Chair: There may also be the need for additional languages as well. I think we will also ask that that be looked into. Anything else on the subcommittee report?

Mr Beer moves that the subcommittee's report be accepted.

The Chair: All those in favour? Opposed?

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: On the budget, which is the next item, let's deal first with Mr Malkowski's comments. That is where? On the third page?

Mr Malkowski: The first paragraph, talking about the 20 days and the two interpreters.

The Chair: You were saying that that should be four?

Mr Malkowski: You normally have four interpreters for something like that, for all day.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: There is something broken down on that last page that says four simultaneous translators should be—

Clerk of the Committee: If I could just explain for a moment, the interpreters you have on staff already I believe are being paid out of—correct me if I am wrong—the Speaker's office, out of that budget. We did not feel they had made provision for the additional interpreters you may have to hire in order to complete this committee work. These are for the additional interpreters I was told your office would be hiring.

The Chair: Rather than getting into a debate over that, if I could test the committee on this, we will take a look at that and if it requires an adjustment to the budget for that particular issue, we can just go ahead and do that before we submit the budget to the Board of Internal Economy. Is that acceptable? I think it is just a question of sorting out which budget the cost of the interpreters is coming from, Mr Malkowski.

Any other questions on the budget? I think overall one can make a comment that it is larger than one might have wanted, but I think it is understandable under the circumstances. We tried, through the subcommittee, to look at different ways, but I think realized in the end that, given the task we had been mandated to carry out, particularly given the mandate to televise our meetings and our hearings and the fact that a large part of the cost is associated with that aspect, the budget proposal was relatively justifiable.

Ms Churley: I take it that some of the cost towards the communication can be attributed to the fact that on some days we are going to be literally doing two places in

a day and in fact we will need an extra crew to keep up with us.

The Chair: Yes, that is part of it.

Ms Churley: Because we are trying to do so much in such a short time.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I wanted to look at the witness travel and expenses. How did we arrive at that figure? What kind of encouragement are we giving or what kind of need are we trying to serve? I know how this normally works, but this is not the normal kind of committee. A committee does not usually travel this much, so I am just wondering what you are basing this on. I know it is only an estimate.

The Chair: Quite frankly, it was our staff's best guess, based on some of the discussions we have had. One of the things that probably is not even covered in that is the issue of how far we wish to go in making it possible, for example, for people from a particular community that is close to a place where we will be holding hearings to come and join us for those discussions. For example, we talked about the possibility of making buses available. I do not know how much we have actually covered that aspect. We may have underestimated that part of it. I think it was a best guess at this point.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So you really do not have a strategy of how much the \$30,000 is based on. Does the clerk, through her experience, have any—

Clerk of the Committee: What the subcommittee was talking about was some very different type of thing where, say, if a community was fairly close, within bus distance, to where we were meeting, we would have a bus available. How often we do this, we will have to wait and see if there is any demand for it. We do not know at this point. I recognize it is high.

One of the other things, and we will probably talk about this later when we get to the outreach program, was to encourage more people to attend. This may come into play more when we are on our first week and the distances are greater. We would pay some of the expenses for groups to come to maybe Kenora, maybe Dryden, maybe Sioux Lookout to attend meetings. That is something the committee will have to address on an individual basis.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I guess my underlying concern—you have mentioned buses—is that there are some communities in this province that we will not be touching, that are only able to be reached by air. We do not usually fly people. Usually what it means is that people come here by train, for the most part, to Toronto; at least that has been my experience. I just wondered how flexible we are going to be and how we are going to let people know that if they really have a message for us, which is what we usually have said, they will be somehow supported to come.

The Chair: I think what we will have to do is work on the understanding that areas of the budget like that are going to have to be subject to being revisited by us, particularly as we hear back from our outreach people around some of the needs they might be hearing about. I

think that is something we will have to be open to taking another look at.

1800

Ms Harrington: With regard to the other committees we have been discussing, how would the cost of this committee compare? Maybe Mr Beer could let us know how it would compare.

Mr Beer: One of the real differences, I think it is important to underline, is that we have been directed very specifically to get out into all of the different communities. When we were looking at the accord, we did go to a number of places, but we found that a number of groups and organizations asked if they could come down here. The vast bulk of our hearings were held in this room, with groups from the far north and indeed people from other provinces coming here, for a variety of reasons.

To be quite honest, I cannot remember what our overall budget was from beginning to end. Certainly in terms of the kind of travel this committee is doing, there was no comparison, because we did not do the same amount of travel. As the Chairman was mentioning, because we are going to be in so many centres, what we talked about in the subcommittee was trying to get people from nearby communities if they wanted to come into those centres as opposed to coming down here.

Ms Harrington: I would just like to point out that the citizens of Ontario have already, over the past couple of years, put a lot of money into this concern and I certainly hope they get their money's worth.

Mr F. Wilson: My question has more to do with travel than the budget. Is it appropriate now? I have a question on travel, not so much to do with the budget.

The Chair: Just on the process? There are a number of other things like this we want to provide some additional information to members of the committee on. We thought we could do that informally at the end of the public session. If it fits into the details of the travel, we can deal with it then.

Mr F. Wilson: It was a remark that was made to us by the clerk, I believe, at one of our last meetings, that when we are travelling close to our own constituencies, it is probably more economical and practical for some members to travel independently from the mob. I was wondering how much time the clerk would need to make sure that air fares were not charged and that type of thing.

The Chair: I think that is the kind of detail we can get into later on.

Mr F. Wilson: I am just assuming that our schedule is set now and will not be varied from.

The Chair: Yes. We have resisted all temptations to try to make any more changes to the travel schedule.

Mr F. Wilson: If you could let me know, because I would like to make certain arrangements, I am assuming others would also.

The Chair: Everyone on the committee should take a look at the travel schedule in relation to where they are from to see if in any of the weeks for whatever reason it makes more sense for you to join us at the place we are

beginning, as opposed to starting from Toronto and travel with the committee. Then you should contact the clerk as soon as possible so those arrangements can be made. Otherwise, we will assume that everyone will be travelling with the committee from Toronto to wherever we are going and then back.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Just an observation in response to Ms Harrington's question. I do think this is a very extraordinary budget for a committee. What it will say to the Ontario people, I hope, is that we realize there is a very deep concern in a process that was not successful in the immediate past, to be specific, June 1990, and that we as a province and your government's leadership have decided to make a commitment to the people of Ontario to try to listen to what they really believe would be at least a solution from their perspective, or at least to open a window to have them heard. So we are providing everything, from closed captioning to all the support this committee needs, to very elaborate television. I do not think a committee has ever carried its television crew with it before. I might be wrong, but that is what I think.

What we are hoping to do, and I am very happy with the way we are beginning, is trying to involve the Ontario people with ourselves. I think to this point the Ontario media have been looking for some leadership. As you see, the Bélanger-Campeau committee got so much coverage in Ontario newspapers. I hope we will get some of the same attention, not because any of us wants to gain a profile but because we have a job to do.

I have two or three questions. What is that S & P Data Corp all about?

The Chair: That is the company that will be providing the service in the 1-800 number.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: And the Alpha Consultants, 11 people.

The Chair: The outreach.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: They will be active for the month of February?

The Chair: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The simultaneous translation—three interpreters times five days. That seems awfully—

The Chair: Where is that?

Clerk of the Committee: If I can just explain it, it is actually quite simple. Our wonderful interpreters up here will be travelling with us. There are two days we know for sure they will not be able to be on the road with us and we will have to get additional interpreters. I have also put in a little extra funding in case anyone gets sick and has to be replaced.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I know they are excellent. They have been with us on the Bill 4 stuff, and they are congenial as well as good travellers.

Books and publications. Is that research papers for us?

The Chair: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think the subcommittee has done an excellent job in presenting this budget. I think we should, with pride, explain why it is such an expensive venture.

I have one last question as I turn that page. Signage. Is that the ads in the paper?

The Chair: It is connected with the trucks and broadcasting services, etc, to actually do some of that internal advertisement of the committee's work. Maybe the clerk could explain it in more detail than I can.

Clerk of the Committee: I understand there will be a number of vehicles travelling with the committee in terms of broadcasting. There will be the uplink van, a couple of other vans and things like that, and they want to put the committee name over some of the existing markings on the vehicles so we will have something representing the committee.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We are really a travelling road show.

The Chair: Any other questions or comments?

Mr Beer moves that the select committee on Ontario in Confederation adopts the budget in the amount of \$1,817,999 and that the chair be directed to present this budget to the Board of Internal Economy.

Motion agreed to.

The Chair: Unless there are any other items to deal with in public, I think we can adjourn at this point. Actually, before we do that, we should sort out the time for tomorrow afternoon. I have heard 4 o'clock or 4:30, 4:30 being suggested as easier for other members finishing other committee meetings.

Ms Churley: I do have another committee meeting, and although I am trying to make this a priority, for obvious reasons, if other people could agree, that extra half hour would be better.

The Chair: Would 4:30 cause a problem for any members of the committee?

Mr Harnick: What is the anticipated length of tomorrow's session?

The Chair: My expectation is that between an hour and an hour and a half would be a reasonable time to do it. Essentially, tomorrow what we would like to do is have the committee briefed on the discussion paper which will be released tomorrow afternoon.

Mr Harnick: Would it be safe to say that we will be finished by 6:30?

The Chair: At the outside. I would think even by 6 o'clock, but by 6:30 at the very outside.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Would it help if we start at 4 rather than 4:30?

The Chair: I suggested that earlier, but then I heard from some of the members on this side that 4 would be a little difficult, so 4:30 was suggested.

Mr Beer: As Liberals we are agreeable to 4 or 4:30.

The Chair: If there are no objections to 4:30, then we will adjourn until 4:30 tomorrow afternoon. If we want to take a couple of minutes now upon adjournment for an informal session we will continue some discussion for a little with the people from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs as well as dealing with any details around the travel schedule that people might have. All right? We are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 1810.

CONTENTS

Monday 28 January 1991

Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs	C-11
Legislative Research Service	C-21
Subcommittee Report	C-23
Adjournment	C-27

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Wininger, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Sutherland, Kimble (Oxford NDP) for Mr Bisson**Clerk:** Manikel, Tannis**Staff:** Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-3 1991

C-3 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament



Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 29 January 1991

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 29 janvier 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Briefing

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Séance d'information

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Tuesday 29 January 1991

The committee met at 1642 in room 151.

BRIEFING:

MINISTRY OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Chair: I call the meeting to order and welcome the members of the committee back. As you know, this meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation is scheduled for us to have a briefing from the Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs on the discussion paper which was released earlier today by the government. We have with us again this afternoon Donald Obonsawin, the Deputy Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and with him also is David Cameron, special adviser. Without further ado, I will turn the floor over to Mr Obonsawin to proceed with the presentation.

Mr Obonsawin: I would like to take 30 seconds to introduce the people with me today. As you see, I have changed my colleagues, the group who are going to be supporting me here today.

This is Stephen Bornstein, who as we indicated yesterday is the recently appointed *député général* of Ontario to Quebec. Stephen began with us earlier this week and has already been to Quebec meeting with some of the officials over there and government representatives, so I thought it might be useful to have him, first of all, introduced to the committee, and second, if you have any additional questions later, you can take that opportunity.

I also have with me David Cameron. Since we are going to be talking today and focusing on the discussion paper, I thought it would be very useful to have David here with us since he really was within the ministry co-ordinating the intergovernmental initiative that was at hand and that in fact put the paper together. Very shortly, I will be passing the microphone to David and asking him to go over the document with you to give you maybe a bit of a better sense as to what the document is attempting to do.

Let me simply say that the document is a discussion document. When initially there were discussions as to what the format would look like and the content would look like, there was a lot of discussion if it should be a position document, which in fact outlined in a definite way what the issues were, outlined in a definite way what government positions should be or should not be. But in fact that would have precluded the work the committee is doing. The committee is here and is beginning its sessions and its audiences in fact to hear from Ontarians and others what are their perceptions of the issues and how they would like to see the government develop positions on those issues.

We thought we would attempt not to take positions but rather to ask questions, to try to give the general public a brief sense of what the issues were and at the same time ask some questions which may not be in fact all-inclusive

but at least help to get the discussion under way and to help the dialogue happen.

The other challenge that we faced in putting the document together is that we did not want to focus in on the, if you wish, constitutional experts with the document. A lot of the experts already know what the issues are. There have been a number of books and articles and treatises written about it, and so we were not really aiming to that client group with the document.

As much as possible, we want to try, and I know the committee wants to try, to broaden the discussion and to try to get as many people as possible involved in understanding what the issues were. We have consequently attempted to maybe demystify certainly some of the language. We have tried not to make it too bureaucratic, although I would be interested in getting feedback from your unbiased perceptions as to how well we have succeeded in doing that. But you will see that in fact the paper is not a technical paper. At least we hope that it is not a technical paper, but a paper that attempts to sensitize people in a general way to what the issues are.

We are also faced with the challenge of length. We were somewhat concerned that if the paper was too long the general public might not be interested in reading it. Again, another element that we took into consideration was in fact, how do we put something forward that is relatively short, that will capture the interests of the reader and which would ensure that hopefully the document will be read?

It really is within these parameters, I suppose one could say, that we table with you today this document.

What the document attempts to do is invite every citizen in the province of Ontario to reflect on what we consider to be some of the fundamental questions which in fact relate to the issues which the country and the province will be facing, and we attempt to provide some maybe basic background to these issues.

We want to encourage Ontarians to think about their province and to think about the role that their province needs to play in the country, in how their province relates to other provinces in this federation.

We are also asking Ontarians to consider how they are governed, not only in an institutional sense but also in terms of which government in this country should be responsible for what responsibilities.

You will notice that we have highlighted international trends at the same time because they do affect the country as we talked about yesterday. Not only do the citizens need to consider how they are going to be living within the country but also how they situate themselves within an international context and international pressures.

Most important, I think the document strongly encourages all Ontarians to participate in this debate, which we

hope will be a public debate, by appearing before this committee or by calling in to a toll-free number which is listed in the booklet or by writing to the committee, and again, there is a tear sheet in the booklet which hopefully will facilitate that.

Each section of the discussion document you have seen basically provides a brief overview of the issue and then concludes with a set of questions, which again, let me repeat, are not all-inclusive. There may in fact be a number of other questions but in order for us to meet all those other parameters that I mentioned earlier, we limited ourselves to those questions.

Having said that, I would now like to turn it over to David, who will give you a better sense of the content of the paper.

Mr Cameron: Mr Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here. I want to wish you and your colleagues all the best in what I think will be a very heavy responsibility and a fairly urgent one, not just the timetable of your work but I think the issues you are going to have to be wrestling with in the coming months.

If I could say just a word about the context of the paper before starting through it, the failure of Meech Lake I think is pushing the country into a significant crisis, but I do not think the crisis we are confronting is exclusively related to the status of Quebec in Confederation. As the paper points out, I think a range of issues are at play here now, issues relating to Meech Lake and the status of Quebec, the recession, the deficit, language questions, aboriginal rights, free trade, regionalism, questions of Senate reform and so on. There is quite a wide range of issues.

I think more than that there is a declining consensus on the values that we share as Canadians that is underlying this and helps to get all these things entangled in one quite unmanageable ball of problems.

1650

I think one of the dimensions of this issue that you as a committee are going to be confronting is in fact the gap which exists between what Canadians in Quebec are saying and doing and what Canadians in the rest of the country are saying and doing, because this is not the first time and probably will not be the last; that is, it as if there are two universes of discourse at play here.

You see evidence of that with the Parti québécois convention on the weekend and with the Parti libéral du Québec paper that has just been released today, although I have not seen it myself as yet, and the work of the Bélanger-Campeau commission and the presentations that have been made to it. So you have a very active process of discussion and quite a fundamental one going on in Quebec. It is my impression that elsewhere in the country there is a pretty low level of awareness and a relatively low level of interest in the sorts of issues that are being addressed by our fellow Canadians in Quebec.

It seems to me that one of the rationales for the committee itself and certainly for the discussion paper is to help to close that gap somewhat by inviting Ontarians to reflect on some of the issues confronting the country and to develop the interest in participating in what is going to

be a really crucial debate for our society. What the discussion paper does is provide a number of suggested areas for consideration. I think the term "discussion paper" should be underlined. That is exactly what it is. It is designed to be a kind of discussion starter and I think in those senses is meant to be dogmatic with respect to the range of issues that are covered or the specific points that are made. It really is to try to encourage people to begin to reflect on the issues that the committee, I expect, will be wanting to talk to Ontarians about.

The final point I would make by way of introduction is that it does seem to me important for all of us to recognize that this is the first step in what will be a long process. I know the timetable of the committee is wondrously brief and you are going to be having to get back to the Legislature before you have blinked virtually, which is quite a challenge. I guess all of that and I think the submissions and discussion that comes from Ontarians should be informed with the appreciation that this is not going to be the first time any of us talk about these matters. We will be back at it. It is not going to go away and this is the first step in a process in Ontario that I think will extend some distance into the future.

If I could turn to the discussion paper itself and point initially to the introductory pages entitled Canada at the Crossroads, I would just like to underline a few points that are made at this stage by way of outlining the overall situation. One of the first points that the paper makes is that in a free society the capacity of a country to continue is based ultimately on the will of its citizens to have that country continue, and the observation is made that people are increasingly questioning whether that common will to preserve the country and keep it as a going concern exists with the same vigour that it has existed in the past. So that is a point of departure, I think, inviting Ontarians to reflect on some of the issues contained in the paper.

The second point, that I made a bit earlier, is the contention that it is not just an issue concerned with this or that particular political problem or public policy concern, but it is convergence of those issues and serious questions about whether we share values in the way we appear to have done in the past.

The third point is the recognition that the country is going to change. Inevitably, whether we would prefer that or not, we are faced with that reality. That being so, it seems preferable to examine what the forces are that are pushing us towards change, consider what our interests and aspirations are and, as much as possible, take charge of the forces of transformation rather than simply be subject to them.

The final point I would draw your attention to is, the question is raised about whether these sorts of issues are better left to the leadership of the government of Canada. I think traditionally the Ontario government has been somewhat inclined to do that on previous occasions that have some similarity to this, but the position of the paper, and I think of the government itself, is that the capacity of the federal government, which has preoccupations for the country as a whole, to represent the specific concerns and interests of Ontarians and of Ontario, as such, is limited. It

has a different mandate, and the mandate and responsibilities confronting Ontario are distinctive and need to be addressed.

Therefore, it is really important for Ontarians to participate in these issues in two guises, one as Canadians and the other guise as Ontarians. Clearly there is extensive overlap between the two, but the perspective and posture and views are discernibly different in each case.

I would like to turn now to the questions for discussion. There are eight questions that have been identified. I suspect in the conversation that follows our presentation there may be questions about whether they are the right eight or whether eight are sufficient, but eight seemed about as high as we could count in preparing the material, so we stopped at that stage.

In each of the sections, with respect to each of these questions that are raised, there is an effort, with a greater or lesser degree of success, to try to get people to recognize that what we face are not easy answers to easy questions, but typically tradeoffs between aspirations that we hold and cannot achieve simultaneously to the same degree. What we are really needing to consider as Canadians are some of those tradeoffs and the balance that we want to strike with respect to the nature of the country and the initiatives that we would be prepared to support.

The point I made earlier, I would underline that I think in each case we are trying to underline the fact that there are forces of change that work on our society under these various headings and they do need our attention, because we will be subject to those forces, rather than creative participants, in shaping them if we do not pay attention to them.

I guess the final point is that with respect to each of these, there has been an attempt to try to ensure that what may be regarded as fairly technical matters are in fact framed in a way that permits people who are concerned as citizens about their country to discuss those. Ultimately, a country cannot be too complicated for its citizens to discuss, nor can the central issues. We have tried to raise them and present them in that fashion.

If I may, I would just take you through each of these eight areas of discussion. The first is entitled, What are the Values We Share as Canadians? The paper looks at some of the things that traditionally have been candidates to define the Canadian identity: the existence of two of the world's great languages; the fact that we combine both the parliamentary and federal government—that is a bit *recherché* perhaps; maybe political scientists would identify that more readily than most people—our non-revolutionary tradition; multiculturalism; the health care system, or even hockey.

The second point that is made is that we celebrate our diversity as a society, which really goes back to the very origins of the Canadian community with the encounter of the aboriginal peoples and the Europeans but has been enriched and expanded and deepened with the passing of time, with French-English relations and clearly with the successive waves of immigration that have hit our society and have enriched the nature of our culture and our identity.

In recognition of that, there is a note that the principle of multiculturalism, Canada's multicultural heritage is rec-

ognized in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms of 1982, in section 27. Again, a recognition of the nature of our society, the principle of the equality of men and women is recognized in section 28 of the charter.

1700

Having made some observations of that kind, there are a series of questions and the first one asks, what held the country together in the past, whether the forces remain as strong today as they did in the past? If they are weakening, are there new forces of identity and common affiliation that are emerging that we should be thinking of building on as a society?

Again, and here is the tradeoff question or the balancing question, if one identifies these features, it is worth thinking about as Ontarians whether they are features that other parts of the community would in fact identify as well. So a useful test is to think of whether somebody in western Canada who is preoccupied with the triple E Senate, for example, and regional alienation would react the same way to the common features that we might identify here in Ontario and equally whether people in Quebec would react similarly.

The final question underlines the point that it is one thing to celebrate our diversity, but it is important as well to celebrate what we hold in common. Do we pay enough attention as a community to what we hold in common compared to the celebration of some of the things that distinguish us one from another?

The second question is, "How can we secure our future in the international economy?" This is really included because if one thinks back to the Quebec referendum period and even the last constitutional round of 1980-1982 prior to Meech Lake, I do not believe that the international economic realities were nearly as much on our minds as Canadians as we wrestled with how to shape the future of our society.

There is no question that this is a central force that is pressing in on all of us these days and one to which we have to respond. This section really invites Ontarians to consider that and to consider both the benefits that arise out of large-scale integration and the costs that typically have to be paid for those benefits. That is a lesson the European community has learned. It is a lesson we are certainly having to learn with respect to the free trade arrangement between Canada and the United States. I think the costs of that degree of economic integration are becoming evident to many people. There are costs and benefits, obviously associated with Canada itself, if one looks at it from an economic perspective: fair degree of integration, fair advantages in that integration, but also regional pressures and so on.

That section ends with some questions about whether we are managing our economy to serve people's needs effectively, whether Ontario's economic goals, as they have emerged over the past decade or so, are similar to or different from the goals of other parts of the country, and the question about our international competitiveness and how we reconcile ensuring that we are competitive on the international market with the very important domestic, social

and economic goals of full employment, price stability, some equity in income distribution and so on.

The third question is, "What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? in Canada in the future. I guess one might advance a hypothesis that somebody did recently as a way of distilling what we are getting at here, some of the questions. Someone said recently that nation states may be becoming too small for the big problems and too big for the small problems. That encapsulates, I think, the issue that Ontarians are being invited to discuss in this section of the paper.

The questions are asked at the end of that. What are the appropriate economic and social responsibilities of the province and of the federal government? What kind of sharing is appropriate among the various parts of our national community? What principles should guide us in that sharing and

redistribution practice?

The fourth question asks, "How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?" A way of summing this section up is to say that aboriginal peoples are the longest here in the country, the worst off and the fastest-growing community in Canada. A lot of emphasis is put in this section on the fact that aboriginal peoples are, by almost every indicator, worse off than other Canadians and that has been the case for a long time. It is still the case now and there are therefore both constitutional and broad policy ramifications for that, and there are policy implications if governments are going to try to address themselves to improve the quality of life of aboriginal people.

It is clear that with the summer of discontent that followed Meech Lake last summer, there is a message I think for the majority society in that necessity of addressing aboriginal issues. As I say, they have both constitutional and non-constitutional dimensions. So the questions at the end of that section are, "How can the right of aboriginal peoples to manage their own affairs be most effectively related to Canadian society?" Again, that relationship issue: How can they be related effectively to Canadian society as a whole? Second, "What approach should be followed to ensure that the needs of aboriginal peoples in Ontario and in Canada are addressed effectively?"

The fifth issue is, "What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?" The points made in that section are that the relations between the French and English languages have historically been both a source of pride and a source of conflict in this country, right from the beginning or at least since the English and the French have begun to live together in this part of the world.

Another point that is made is that demographically the two language communities are becoming increasingly concentrated, so that Quebec is becoming more French and the rest of the country is becoming more English. That seems an inexorable demographic reality that has gone on for some time and would appear likely to continue; worth reflecting on, I think. Then the observation is made that despite that, there are significant French-speaking minorities spread across the country, the largest numerically of which is in Ontario, in this province, and that there is a significant English-speaking minority in Quebec. I hope I

got that right: French across the county, English minority in Quebec.

Then there is an observation on the efforts of the various governments to deal with the language issue in some productive fashion over the past 20 years or so, both provincial governments, Quebec specifically, and the federal government. It does seem to be the case that a good many Canadians in the light of some of the events that have occurred recently believe that something is amiss with how we are tackling the language question in this country. I am thinking of the reaction of many English-speaking Canadians to Bill 178 in Quebec and the use of the "notwithstanding" clause and the reaction of many French Canadians to some of the initiatives provinces have taken to cut back support of the French language in their provinces.

So the questions are raised: "How can we better support the needs and aspirations of our linguistic minorities?" How can we lessen the tensions between the two communities and what should be the roles of the federal and provincial governments in that field?

The sixth area: "What is Quebec's future in Canada?" The point is made citing the Task Force on Canadian unity which was co-chaired by John Robarts, the former Premier of Ontario. The point is made that there are six distinctive features of Quebec society that were identified by that commission: first, a distinctive history; second, the predominance obviously of the French language; third, the existence of civil law in that province as well as common law, unlike elsewhere; fourth, "the common ethnic origin of a majority of its population;" fifth, "the shared desires, aspirations and even fears of Quebec's population;" finally, "the unique role that politics and the Quebec government play in shaping Quebec society," of which we have evidence in front of us as we speak.

The other point that is made by way of introduction is to underline the degree to which Quebec and the rest of the country have a good deal in common, and particularly Ontario, and some data are advanced, including the fact that about \$30 billion in reciprocal trade occurs each year between the two provinces and about 1.5 million people travel by air between Montreal and Toronto every month. It is an indicator of the kind of economic and social integration that exists certainly between Ontario and Quebec.

1710

The questions then are: "Is the formal recognition of Quebec's distinctiveness consistent with your own conception of Canada and Confederation? How do you think that might be expressed within the framework of Confederation?" Second, "If you don't think that Quebec's distinctiveness should be formally recognized—and yet this proves to be essential for Quebecers—what alternative arrangements" would you have in mind?—the tradeoff question again—and finally, "What arrangements with Quebec will enhance our mutual prosperity?"

The seventh area deals with regionalism, "What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region?" The regional issue surfaces with respect to provinces outside of Ontario and Quebec. We are all regions, but the way regional alienation has emerged, for example, is in the context of either provinces outside of Quebec or groups of

provinces outside of Quebec and both of those are discussed here.

Much of the impulse based on a sense of discontent with the arrangements of Confederation that is felt by the regions of Canada outside of Ontario-Quebec relates to a desire for stronger representation in national policymaking, including better representation in some of the key national institutions. Here the triple E Senate proposal—an equal, elected, effective upper chamber Senate—which attracted a lot of support in western Canada and in parts of the Atlantic region is a major factor or representative of that.

A further element of information that is mentioned is the fact that Canadians have typically over the past decade or so felt a growing attachment to their home province. Indeed there are surveys over the past decade that have shown a declining loyalty on the part of Canadians across the country for national institutions and national symbols, so whatever question you ask, if it is the flag or the Governor General, Parliament, whatever, there is declining loyalty, a declining sense of identification of Canadians with those national institutions.

That is true across the country. The biggest drop in fact is in Ontario. It is true, being an honest social scientist, that the drop is from the highest point. In other words, the strength of attachment has been and continues to be highest in Ontario, but the fall-off in support is largest in this province.

The questions that are asked under this rubric: "How could regional identity best be expressed within the framework of Confederation—by provincial governments or by better regional representation within national institutions" in Ottawa? "How could we strengthen regional or provincial representation in our national institutions?" And, "What arrangements with the Atlantic region, the west and the north will help secure our economic future" collectively?

The final question, the eighth question, is in some respects the key question for the committee, "What does Ontario want?" Typically, that is a question that was put to Quebec in the not-so-distant past. People do not ask that any more. They are pretty good at telling us. But I think that question—"What does Ontario want?"—is based in part on the premise that Ontarians have not traditionally thought of themselves as much as Ontarians as they have as Canadians, and they have not thought of their province and the interests and aspirations of their province within that frame of reference.

The assumption in this section is that it is desirable that Ontarians begin thinking about those matters, that there are features of Ontario society that are distinctive from and different from the rest of the country, and there may be a way of coming at the common interest that is typically Ontario and not synonymous with some general national interest, which is perhaps the way Ontarians have thought about it traditionally.

Ontario is more diverse culturally and racially than the rest of the country. The population has been growing more rapidly in Ontario than is the case elsewhere. Our economy is less and less dependent on trade with other parts of the country, and we rely less on other provinces than any other province on the national market, so there are a variety

of forces that are at work that are shaping our situation in Confederation and probably warrant our considering what our interests and concerns are.

The questions, then, are: "What are the interests and aspirations of the people of Ontario? To what extent are these shared with other Canadians and to what extent are they distinctive? And then, "How can we build bridges between the interests and aspirations of ourselves and those of other Canadians?"

Those are the eight questions. The paper, as you know, winds up with an invitation to Ontarians to participate in this process and notes that your report must be ready by 21 March, so time is short, and then provides information about the 800 number and the card, how the members of the community can get in touch with you and your colleagues to participate in this process.

The Chair: Mr Obonsawin, do you have anything else that you wish to add?

Mr Obonsawin: I do not think so. Maybe the only additional comment is that one of the underlying themes of the paper, I believe, and that was certainly on our minds when we put it together, was to try and get a sense of values. There is an opening statement at the beginning which says that—I forget how it is said—we could maybe get a consensus on issues, but unless we get a consensus on the values that are going to hold us together, then that consensus on issues will simply fade with time. I certainly believe that consensus on values is very important. That is why the paper attempts to start with that discussion, to try and get a sense as to what are the values, what are the beliefs, that we want to share in the country and then hopefully some of the other questions will become a bit easier to answer.

The Chair: Before opening up for questions or comments from members of the committee, I thought it would be useful to perhaps indicate again, for the benefit of those who might be following the committee's proceedings over the parliamentary network, that the discussion paper will be distributed widely. As we understand it, it is going out to every organization or group that is on any of the mailing lists of any of the ministries of the government, so in fact it should reach people far and wide. But obviously there may be people who will not get it who want to get the paper and they can get that by calling the 1-800 number, which I am told should be appearing also on the screen throughout our meetings, but certainly over the next days and weeks will appear from time to time on the parliamentary channel and in various advertisements. That number is 1-800-668-7275.

That number can also be used to get any additional information people might wish to get as well as to indicate that they wish to speak to the committee. Again, I think perhaps later on in the process we will also outline the places we will be visiting over the next four weeks for members of the public. Again, that information is also something that we will try to provide over the parliamentary channel as well as in community advertisements over the next little while. Hopefully there will be a variety of ways in which people can get to us over the next little while.

The 21 March deadline was mentioned in Mr Cameron's presentation, I think, and it is also clear on behalf of the committee to point out that it is for us the end of the first stage of our work and by that time we are entrusted in pulling together an interim report which will hopefully reflect, and obviously reflect, the kinds of things we will have heard, but that we do not see that as a final deadline. It is the first stage of work that we expect will continue, certainly until the time of our final report which is due at the end of June.

Je voudrais aussi ajouter que, certainement, le document de discussion est disponible aussi en français, en effet, c'est publié en anglais et en français dans le même document. Il y a aussi le numéro de téléphone pour informations que j'ai indiqué ; il y aura là des gens qui pourront certainement vous donner des informations et des renseignements en français.

In addition to that, I would like to say that there is also going to be a short version or a summary, I suppose, of the discussion paper in both English and French as well as a number of other additional languages: Italian, Portuguese, Chinese, Spanish and Greek. It is also an attempt to try to reach out in a wider way to people who maybe have an easier facility in some of those languages. With that, I will open it up to comments or questions. Mr Malkowski was first.

1720

Mr Malkowski: I have two comments. First, we have a 1-800 number. Is that also a telecommunications device for the deaf line?

The Chair: The clerk is not here at this moment, but I think she had indicated yesterday, Mr Malkowski, that was something that was being looked into. I do not know what the answer to that question is at this point.

Mr Malkowski: Normally, to indicate, you need to have it printed clearly—voice flash TDD or teletype—to indicate so.

Mr Bisson: For the information, one of the things the subcommittee looked at was the question of being able to provide that. The difficulty we are in right now is trying to set it up technically in time. My understanding is that there is a strong possibility that it will be in place, but it is something that we have turned our attention to.

The Chair: I think, Mr Malkowski, as soon as we are able to set that up we will also again use whatever facilities we have to advertise the existence of that number.

Mr Malkowski: Okay, if you could please be sure to include that. Another brief point: You were talking about the Constitution and non-Constitution. Are you talking about charter rights? What are you referring to when you use the term "non-constitutional" or "non-Constitution"?

Mr Cameron: The point that I was trying to make is that I think the issue, if you treat it as a single issue, that we are confronting as a country is complex, and the kinds of responses that will be appropriate are not going to be exclusively constitutional. There may be arrangements between the national government and the provincial governments that will be worked out within the framework of the

existing Constitution and will require no change. There may be public policy initiatives that governments in Ontario or the government in Ottawa could undertake that will not be constitutional in character. So there are a variety of potential responses just as I think the issue itself is more than purely constitutional. When one talks about the declining consensus on values, that clearly is not something that can be responded to purely in constitutional terms.

Ms Harrington: When I first picked this document up this afternoon I was very pleased. I would like to commend you on it. First of all it was very light, and when I think of sending out 80,000 copies that is a consideration. It is also an inviting type of document, something that I believe people will actually read. It is involving, and I really was gratified to see this invitation card to send back as well as the 800 number.

I wanted to note that I would hope that possibly schools across this province will make use of this document. As a one-time teacher, I think it would be good either at a senior public school level or even at the high school level. So I certainly hope that schools will have access to this document. Are they automatically sent to schools, Mr Chairman?

The Chair: I believe, in the list that I certainly saw, there were actually provisions for copies to go to schools. But, Mr Obonsawin, you may want to comment more on that.

Mr Obonsawin: It very definitely will be going to the schools. We have not had a chance yet to talk with the Ministry of Education to see if they are going to be doing maybe some «animation» to ensure that there is some sort of follow-through in the school systems. But they definitely will be sent to the schools.

Ms Harrington: I want to make one other comment. I have not really thought this through completely, but on page 9 you are talking about international economy, and in the middle of the third paragraph it says: "The benefits of a larger market do not come without costs. Jobs will be lost as companies and their workers are forced to adjust to the new economic circumstances." I know you are talking about Europe, but it also applies to Canada and Ontario and I think it is a little bit confusing trying to deal with the whole international economy. I think people may find this paragraph a little bit difficult. I just wondered if you would have any comment on that.

Mr Cameron: If it is the only paragraph they find difficult, I would regard it as a success. I take your point. I think those who were preparing the paper at every step of the way thought: "How consistent with one page of text, with a lot of white surface on the page. How can you say something useful and helpful and what is it you should say?" I would be amazed if there were not serious lapses along the way in the capacity to express the right thing and the right thing clearly.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: First of all I want to congratulate you, Mr Chair, and the clerk for having these documents right at the precise dot of 1:30 in my office. I was overcome by that commitment.

The Chair: It is a sign of things to come, Mrs O'Neill.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope so. I just hope that has something to do with the way our travel is going to unfold.

I would like to ask a little bit about the short version. For starters, what is it going to look like?

Mr Obonsawin: The short version right now is a first draft that has been prepared. I unfortunately have not seen it yet. I have been busy with a few other things today. It will basically review the headings and give a sense of what the issues are, and then simply indicate to people that if they want to know more, they can apply through the 800 number or whatever for the full text. So it is maybe simply a bit of a teaser to try to get them to read the full text, but it will be easier to mail and it will be easier to ensure a full distribution.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I guess my main question is, will it contain these questions that are following up to the questions?

Mr Obonsawin: Peter Sadlier-Brown has seen it. Peter, do you want to maybe just tell them what you have seen? It is still a draft, but Peter tells me that it has some of the questions but not all the questions.

Mr Sadlier-Brown: The draft that I saw this morning contained some of the questions. It is a summary. It is supposed to be really a précis of the larger document. In that respect, it précis the questions too, it takes sort of the most pointed or the most appropriate of the questions. There are, I think, at most, in the current version or the current draft, two questions in each section.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So we are talking about a document that runs to about eight pages or six pages. Well, that is enough.

The Chair: I am sorry, can we just be clear on that? When you say it takes only a couple of questions in each section, I think maybe, Mrs O'Neill, were you asking whether in fact the eight major issues or questions are there?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes.

Mr Sadlier-Brown: I am sorry. All eight headings that are here, all eight major questions are there. Under the eight headings only one or two of the particular questions that are in this document in the bold type at the end of each section are repeated under the individual heading questions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: And as you were saying, there will be an invitation to extend to the larger document if the group or individual so wishes.

Mr Sadlier-Brown: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay, I had a couple of others. The dates for the ads; we are starting Sunday. How long in advance are these ads preceding our arrival?

The Chair: I am going to ask the clerk to comment on that. The ads have begun to run in a general sense, I think, all over the province, but I think the intent was to then add to that ads in the local communities where we will be going prior to our arrival, obviously, in terms of timing of that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am starting to get questions about this and I would like to have the most up-to-date information that I possibly could.

Clerk of the Committee: I am in contact with our media people. They are supposed to fax me a list of the radio spots, because we are doing radio advertising as well.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That is good.

Clerk of the Committee: I will send out the revised list of when the ads are running in all the community newspapers. I will try to get that out to your offices tomorrow.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think people wish to hear the ads simply because they do not know where we are going to be. They know what city we are going to be in, but where the meeting is going to take place, I think that is pretty crucial information, since we are going to be whizzing through. We do not want them to spend half the day looking for where we are.

Clerk of the Committee: That is part of the problem we are running into, that we have not confirmed a number of the sites, but the ads in the specific locations—for example, Kenora's will be in the Legion there. Originally we gave our advertising people the street address. I do not think they are going to put that in because they felt, talking to the people in Kenora, that they knew where it was. The same with the school in Sioux Lookout. It is small enough that everyone knows where the school is, but they want to put in the street address as well. This will go in the radio ads as well as in the newspaper ads in the specific communities we are visiting and the areas.

1730

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If you can give us what you have to this point, it would be helpful.

My final question is to Mr Cameron. You made a very interesting comment and you kind of hesitated. I would like you to say a little bit more about the attachment of Ontario to the Canadian federation. I do not even know whether you can go back to what you were thinking at that moment, but maybe you can.

Mr Cameron: It is data that have been collected by Michael Adams of Environics.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am not sure he is still one of my favourite people, but we will go with it.

Mr Cameron: This is not a plug, it is simply an acknowledgement that that is where it came from. It is some survey work where repeated questions were asked over a period of approximately a decade. They were asked with respect to what sense of loyalty they felt as citizens to the following, and then they had a series of things: the flag, the Mounties, I think the national Parliament and so on, a number of those sorts of what are regarded as national symbols. Across the board, in every province there is a decline in the sense of identity. That was my point. Then, with respect to Ontario, I am saying that the commitment throughout to national symbols is highest in Ontario, but so is the drop the largest. The drop in commitment is largest.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: It is hard for me to understand. We are still the highest but we have dropped the most.

Mr Cameron: Yes, because we were streets ahead of most other parts of the country. We still are ahead, but we are less ahead than we were before.

Ms Churley: Mr Cameron, I just am not clear on your role in this whole process. I understand that during the Meech Lake discussion you were a special adviser to Quebec. I am not sure, could you clarify your role in this whole process now?

Mr Cameron: All right.

Ms Churley: Are you a constitutional expert?

Mr Cameron: I will tell you what I was doing and what I am doing now. I will not answer that question.

Interjection: Just do not tell us you are a two-fisted economist.

Mr Cameron: No, I will not. Until July I was fully and formally with the government of Ontario. In the last year I had two roles; I was the adviser to the Premier on the Constitution and I was the Ontario government representative to Quebec, so it was a double role. I resigned from the government at the beginning of July and returned to the University of Toronto. If you really want to know this, I am telling you. I love talking about myself. I continued through the summer as Quebec representative and I continued from the beginning of July, on a part-time basis obviously, consistent with my work at U of T, to work with the government on the post-Meech situation. I am still doing that. That is my role.

Ms Churley: My question is related, I guess, to constitutional experts. I assume there are not that many in the country and I expect that there—

Interjection: There are more every day.

Ms Churley: There are more growing every day. The issue I am getting at, I guess, and you would know more about this than I do, is, one of the prevailing images throughout the Meech Lake accord for a lot of people, and I think particularly women, is that there were a bunch of men who got together in a room and made some pretty important decisions. Not only women, of course, other disadvantaged groups felt very shut out and were complaining. I think quite justifiably, that in many of the processes there was not enough access and opinions were not being listened to.

Of course, we want to do things differently now and we want to make sure that those voices are heard. I just wondered, if you would not mind talking a bit for a few minutes, about how you see we can do things a little differently so that the people who felt so shut out before—I know that women, for instance, and I am sure you do as well, the feminist groups and other groups were quite concerned about their constitutional rights being tampered with and that they were not taken seriously, that they were not listened to and it was mostly a bunch of men who were not listening to them, the status quo. I just wanted to hear what you have to say about that.

Mr Cameron: I do think what we have been living with throughout this decade has been an increasing democratization of the constitutional process, so the old ways of doing things, which may have worked at one point, do not

work any longer. Executive federalism, ie, 11 men in a room, has become a term of real opprobrium in this country for the reasons that I think you are suggesting.

My perception is that people learn over time and come to grips with a new situation over time. They do not all do it at the same pace and they do not all do it instantly. I think there were some assumptions that animated the putting together of Meech Lake, and that were proven to be incomplete, about public participation, the degree of public interest in the constitutional process and the need to have an openness when there was still a capacity to have an effect. Clearly the process we are engaged in now, as are a number of other governments, is in response to that evolution of political culture in this country.

I guess one observation I would make is that I think it is easier to attack executive federalism than to replace it. I do not think the issue is that it is a bad thing and you should get rid of it, because at the end of the day, at least as things stand, one still has a parliamentary form of government with the heads of government—prime ministers, premiers—who have to strike some kind of an understanding. But I think it is possible, and this is what we are embarked on. I think it is possible, if you like, to tame and democratize the process and ensure that people who are interested and concerned and whose interests are affected by the outcome are given ample opportunity to express their views and have a role in shaping the ultimate outcome.

I do not think that makes reaching agreement easier. I think, arguably, it makes it more difficult because then what you are looking at is finding a ground of accommodation that is much more fundamental and more popularly based than perhaps was the case before. But I do think that is the reality of the country now.

Ms Churley: But you could also say that in Meech Lake there seemed to be a willingness to compromise—I should not say compromise, actually, but perhaps to not listen enough to the diverse groups that had some problems with it, and that in fact it was almost, “So let’s get this through at all costs or the country will fall apart.” It failed, of course. That certainly did not work either. I guess it is finding that balance.

Mr Cameron: Once the Meech process was embarked on, there was a technical problem in listening to anybody; in the sense of actually taking into account what people were saying, that it was a packaged deal and it was put together using two amending instruments in the Constitution, one that required seven provinces and 50% of the population and the other unanimity, all provinces. Because there were those two elements, it was judged that the package required unanimity plus the three-year deadline, which is a function of the 7-50 formula—but unanimity for the purposes of this discussion.

Any change in the package of amendments would then require it to be changed by all of the participants as soon as anybody had passed it. Quebec was the first province within I think three weeks of the Langevin accord that had passed Meech Lake. You change a comma in that package to deal with the quite understandable concerns that people had and you had to go back to Quebec and say, “Pass it

again through the Legislature." There are politics in Quebec, as there are everywhere else in the country, and then when each one was added the difficulty was heightened more and more.

That was the technical constraint on actually responding to these concerns. In a sense, what did not happen was that between the Meech Lake agreement at Meech Lake itself, where the outline in principle of Meech Lake was established, and the Langevin accord, which was a little over a month later, where the actual text of Meech Lake was committed to, there was only a month. I think Quebec was the only government that actually consulted with its Legislature, let alone held hearings.

If that stage in the process had been opened up to a year and all governments had gone back to their legislatures and there had been committees and hearings, you would have dealt with that sense of being excluded and not being heard. Whether you would have ended up with Meech Lake at the end of the process is a question I think you committee members and all of us have to ask ourselves.

1740

Mr Beer: I wonder if Mr Cameron or Professor Cameron, given your dual role, you might reflect on the experience you had as a representative in Quebec in this context. I think we all recognize that the historical relationship of Ontario and Quebec, as has been pointed out, has been very important. There is a whole series of things that has linked us together. In the current situation, that would seem to me to be still a very critical role. At the same time, we know that Quebec has said that after Meech, it wants to deal with the federal government in any of the discussions. There is bound to be, among some people as we go around, a certain sense of what in fact Ontario can really do at this juncture when we see either the Quebec Liberal Party's submission or what may come from Bélanger-Campeau, certainly listening to Jacques Parizeau.

How do we find a role for the province? From your experience in working closely with the Quebec government, both elected officials and other groups there, would you say that that role of Ontario has changed significantly over the last couple of years? And from that, is what we do still of perhaps a different kind of importance than, let's say, a report that might come from another province or even in fact from the federal government? Are they still interested in what we think about the future of the country, about the links between the two provinces, about their role in Canada, or in our views on different kinds of sovereignty or even independence?

Mr Cameron: I can give you my observations. Stephen is not here but—

Mr Beer: I was going to ask him as well.

Mr Cameron: He has escaped.

Mr Obonsawin: He apologizes. He had to go to an interview.

Mr Cameron: One thing that struck me while I was functioning in that capacity was the openness and interest of the Quebecers that I dealt with in Ontario, Ontario practices, in information about what was happening here

and in working with Ontario. That surfaced in all kinds of ways.

One of the most obvious connections was among the governments, where the scale of the two governments is more alike, setting aside the federal government, than any other provinces to Quebec or Ontario. So we have a lot to talk to just because they are big governments, they are complex organizations and they are large societies. There was a very strong curiosity about what was being done in Ontario and an interest in exploring that, a lot of exchanges and movement back and forth.

But that was broader than purely the government. I guess parenthetically, I would say that throughout the period we are moving into, the more we in Ontario can sustain and expand the relationships on all fronts with Quebec, the better off both will be and so will the country. I think those are really important and nobody should be pulling down the shutters at this juncture; quite the reverse.

Another point that struck me was that I did have the impression that, for many Quebecers, their predominant information about the rest of the country and their general understanding of the rest of the country was grounded in an understanding of Ontario more than anywhere else. Ontario was the symbol.

In some cases, Ontario was mistaken to be the rest of the country, but it was certainly regarded as the most reliable representative of English-speaking Canadian views and positions and attitudes in English-speaking culture. I think that is extremely important for the province, for this committee and for the government as they think about what they do over the coming months and couple of years.

To get to the question about the weight to be attached to what we do here, setting aside the federal government again, I think the government of Ontario, the position of Ontario, what happens in Ontario will be paid far more heed to in Quebec than will what happens in any other jurisdiction in the country, without question.

My impression is that because of the post-Meech environment, the discussion is very internalized now in Quebec, so people are not really thinking that much about the rest of the country, particularly with the Bélanger-Campeau process still under way. But I think at some point fairly soon they are going to lift their heads and be thinking, "How does what we say we want relate to other parts of the country, to the rest of the country?" So I think a sense of exchange and openness and a presence in Quebec on the part of Ontario is very, very important.

Mr Beer: If I might ask a second question which is related, in Quebec and Ontario, we have the largest of the so-called official-language minority groups, and geographically those tend to be concentrated. Certainly one of the concerns that Franco-Ontarians, Ontario francophones, have as we go forward is what place might they have in anything that would be different than the status quo, and I think that same question would obviously be posed to the anglophones in Quebec.

What is your perception of how Quebec sees the francophone minority within Ontario? How important is that to them? What role does that issue, in a sense within the two provinces, of how we deal, each one of us, with our linguistic

minority, play in trying to find some kind of solution, whatever the change may be in a constitutional sense?

Mr Cameron: I think the degree of preoccupation with the francophone minorities elsewhere in the country, and particularly in Ontario, on the part of Quebecers waxes and wanes to some extent, given their preoccupation with their own fortunes and their own circumstances. Again, my impression is that because of the internally focused discussions that are going on, like the rest of the country, perhaps the status of the francophone minorities elsewhere is not on everybody's agenda for discussion, but I do not take it from that that they will go away or have gone away. I think that resurfaces consistently, because there is a constant preoccupation in Quebec with the fortunes of their francophone colleagues elsewhere in the country. So it seems to me it will be a recurring important dimension of the discussions that are carried on between Quebec and other governments.

With respect to the second part of your question, I guess I would make one personal observation. I do think that certainly in Ontario and in Quebec there is a maturity in governments and a maturity growing within the societies. The sort of slightly paternalistic role of the national government with respect to the arrangements for minorities in the provinces was something we experienced in the past.

I am not sure that is as necessary or as profitable a public policy today as it was in the past. It seems to me there is a fair degree of evidence on both sides of a realization that this is an abiding public policy concern for the province and that there need to be recurrent efforts to try to work that out and improve the situation of the two sets of minorities.

1750

Mr Harnick: There is no specific mention in the paper about the amending formula, and it is a difficult, complicated area. Would you anticipate that our examination of some of the people who come before the committee should elicit some ideas about amending formulas?

Mr Cameron: I think the conception of the process and the conception of the paper was that this should be open to people who do not have constitutional expertise. It is their country; they should find the vocabulary to address it and identify the issues as they see them. Perhaps it is not a committee process.

That is for you people obviously to determine, but the conception that I think was in mind was that it is not a process that should automatically invite the usual suspects. You should be getting Ontarians coming, not constitutional experts, at least in this first round. Indeed, the first step in the process is the discussion and ventilation of priorities and values and views about the fundamentals rather than the technicalities of the Constitution, which will come soon enough.

For example, if you move from the interim to the report in June or the committee and legislative process continues beyond that, then it seems that that will be very much a period when having had the general discussion, one can turn to the more specific matters, where there are

constitutional proposals, where the amending formula can be tackled, where the kind of blockage that exists because Quebec wants to proceed bilaterally can be examined and ways can be found for dealing with that.

But that is a bit further down the road; not a lot, but a bit. I think that was the conception that animated the nature of this paper. The Constitution has to be mentioned in the paper, but it is not mentioned very often, and that is why.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I have a couple more questions that have come to mind as we have been discussing. In the reading I have been doing lately there seems to be a new realization among, I presume, business leaders and maybe even the general public in Quebec that separation or whatever is going to have more economic outcomes than had been originally anticipated or maybe even thought about. I wondered if you could comment on whether that is the same perception you have. I am only getting it at second hand.

Mr Cameron: I guess my perception is that I am not sure that that penny has dropped—an appropriate image—entirely yet. When the PQ formed the government in 1976 and during the runup to the referendum in 1980, one of the dominant themes was the discussion of the financial cost of separation. Very few people were arguing that there were financial advantages. It was a question of how much it would cost to do it. That was one of the most potent messages that Quebecers had in mind, I think, as they went to the voting booths in 1980.

One of the striking features this time around is that I do not get a strong sense, either inside Quebec or elsewhere in the country, that people are spending much time thinking about the economic impacts of the country breaking up. I think part of it goes back to some of these questions. We have free trade, which we did not have before. There is globalization in the international marketplace. The role of the national government has been changing. There is a huge national debt that they are wrestling with, so they cannot be the sugar-daddies of Confederation any more. A lot of those factors are playing on people's minds as they think about this, and the economies, the pattern of trade, as we saw with the Ontario economy, have evolved as well.

I think it raises a series of fundamental questions, but my own impression is that neither in Quebec nor elsewhere in the country are people thinking about the remaining costs. Quite apart from anything else, it seems to me that it is going to be at least as expensive to break up the country as it is to break up a marriage. It costs money to divorce, and I have no reason to believe it would not cost heavily. If nothing else, the transition costs would be heavy in the breakdown of the country, unless we have a degree of political maturity that has been unseen on the face of the globe.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The other question I have, again from what I only can pick up in my reading, is there seemed to a long list of things—well, not too long, but 8 to 10 items—where Quebec wants to be independent. I have not seen a list of items where they want to maintain a strong tie. Is

there such a list, a short list, however it may be? Can you speak to that?

Mr Cameron: There are certainly lots of lists about what should be, as the phrase goes, repatriated. For example, the Quebec Chamber of Commerce listed 22 items that it thought should come into Quebec's jurisdiction. People do not make lists of the things that should be tying us together, but the way the ties emerge in the discussion is typically through talking about the economic relationships that ought to continue and be preserved in the country. People will say: "Well, there should clearly be a monetary union. We should clearly have open borders between Ontario and Quebec, for example, because we both benefit from the trading relationship. There should be free movement of people and capital and goods inside Canada and Quebec." That is, in a sense, the list that is being formed.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So they are not really talking about things like defence. They are saying something about monetary systems.

Mr Cameron: Sure, they would mention defence. The focal point tends to be on economic matters, but defence would be a matter. International affairs would be very much up for discussion. There is a range of those matters that are then put forward as areas where common institutions would make sense, or shared responsibility would make sense.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Let's hope we will evoke some clarity on that particular issue, that which can tie us together. I represent one of the ridings in the Ottawa area. Ottawa-Rideau is my riding. I am wondering if you feel there is any particular role or special role for Outaouais, Ottawa-Carleton, simply because of the kind of daily living we do there. I could say more, but I would like to hear your response first.

Mr Cameron: I would like to hear you say more.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I guess I could be very honest in saying we have not, as Ontario MPPs, been successful in getting the MLAs from Outaouais very involved in meeting, joint discussion, and we have tried. I am not saying our efforts were endless, and maybe could have been done in different ways, but there does not seem to be at the moment a great affinity to coming together. The only joint body is the National Capital Commission. As you know, our mayors sometimes meet on the bridge, and sometimes they do not, on 1 July. I am just wondering if you can speak to that at all. I know it is something that is very close to many people I represent.

Mr Cameron: I go back I guess to a point I made earlier. I am not really surprised that there is relatively little taste for that kind of contact coming from the other side of the river at this juncture. First of all, I think it is important that people who have contacts and associations and business to do in the other community keep doing it and keep doing it actively throughout the piece. I think that we are likely to move towards a stage where the question of the relationships between Quebec and the rest of the country becomes increasingly important for Quebecers as they think about that dimension of the issue. Rather than think about themselves on their own or what they want,

how do they relate their priorities to what is the economic, social, political, constitutional reality around them? They have to deal with that, just as we have to deal with what is going on in Quebec. I think that one can expect that to open up more, and it seems to me there will be some—I would hope there would be some—opportunities as a consequence for there to be more fruitful contact between the two.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: The bridges are pretty busy at rush hour between those two provinces.

Mr Cameron: They certainly are.

Mr Obonsawin: Just as a supplementary there to the answer that Mr Cameron gave to Mrs O'Neill, just to remind you that you will be hearing a lot over the next few months about what different opinions are in Quebec as to who wants what. Today, with the Allaire report, which I have not seen yet—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Everybody says he has the Allaire report, but I have not seen it.

Mr Obonsawin: That is right. We know it has been released. I guess we do not have any questions on it right now. Again, that is what the constitutional committee of the party is recommending and it will be dealt with at the party conference next March. Bélanger-Campeau has not yet submitted its report, so all we can really do at the current time is speculate what various groups have tabled at those various forums, what Quebec might want and what it might want to share and not share. So I think we will only know later on this summer, when the Quebec government has had an opportunity to consider those submissions and those reports and will probably then be a bit clearer as to what are the areas it wishes to negotiate or what are the areas it wishes to pursue with Canada and what are the areas it wishes to pursue by itself, just to make sure that people are clear on the fact there really does not exist at this point in time an official magic list.

Mr Bisson: Just for clarification for those watching out there, it may be a good idea just to touch on the process by which people will be able to approach our committee in regard to either oral or written submissions. I know questions have come to my office, "Do I need, as a person, to give a written submission to the committee?" Maybe we can just touch on that.

The Chair: I was going to do that, actually, at the end. There was one other question or comment from Mr Offer. I think that is a good point. We should do that, Mr Bisson.

Mr Offer: I have a question of Mr Cameron. We have heard today, of course, that the Allaire report has been released. We know that Bélanger-Campeau is coming down the line, as well as Spicer in July. What I would like to get from you, from your experience, is your observation as to the speed or the rapidity of events that might take place in Quebec. I think that is important for us in our committee and in our dealings to have some sense from yourself as to, on the basis of your experience, how you feel Quebec—without dealing with the substance of the matter, dealing with the matter itself. What time do we have, in your opinion? I ask the question because I note in

your opening remarks you spoke about this process here being a long-term process, that it is not the last time we will be before this particular committee. I am wondering if you might be able to expand upon that.

Mr Cameron: My observations, for what they are worth, are built on what I see going on in Quebec. First of all, the wind is in the sovereignty sails, and the interests of the PQ and Mr Parizeau lie in having an early referendum that would put the question and move the thing a whole new stage forward.

The interests of the Premier of Quebec, Mr Bourassa, I think lie elsewhere. I do not believe that he is anxious to see this process rushed, because I do not believe he thinks it is in the interests of Quebecers that it be rushed. I think a more evolutionary process, not something that will drag on for ever but one where there are stages and there is a capacity to think and there is a capacity to send messages to the rest of the country and hear whether there are messages back is what he will likely be wanting. He is the Premier, he is back in office, I presume his health is good.

In fashioning my own reflections on the timetable, it seems to me that one of the key future events is the next provincial election, because the Premier is bound to be very concerned about the position that he is in to deal with the next provincial election. So I guess I would say that the likely framework within which he will want to work will be one in which he will have resolved something prior to the next election. He cannot go into the next election with the thing still in train and it being unclear whether the rest of the country wants to talk turkey or not. So I think it will be a timetable within that framework that will push to a conclusion of one kind or another and put him in a position to then go to the people with a platform and a proposal that will make sense and, he would hope, get himself re-elected. There are some conditions and ifs in all of that, obviously, but that would be my working assumption.

It seems to me that we might be looking at an 18-month period, where at the end of that there would need to be some kind of conclusion arrived at. But when I say long-term process, whatever that conclusion is will not be the end of the day either. So whatever way this plays out, it is unfortunate to say it, we are into five years to a decade of this kind of turmoil, I am afraid, and that is why I think we are in it for the long haul. It is the long-distance runners who are going to succeed finally.

The Chair: Given the understanding that we had reached yesterday that we would try to end this by 6:30, it being now 6:05, and the fact that we also do have some items dealing with our travel arrangements and itinerary for next week that we need to deal with in private session, I think it is probably useful to bring this section to a close and thank Mr Obonsawin and Mr Cameron for their comments and being here to go over the discussion paper with us.

I think certainly one could end on a number of notes, but perhaps it is appropriate to do so with the last question that is in the discussion paper, which is, "What does Ontario want?" I think over the next month that certainly will be one of the major tasks for us, to try to sift out and encourage people to come and talk to us so that in fact we can come out of this process having a clear sense as to where the people of Ontario are on the variety of issues that you have touched upon and indeed on many other issues that they wish to talk to us about.

With that in mind, I will pick up on Mr Bisson's suggestion and in effect point out again for the people of the public who may be following us over the parliamentary channel that we will of course be beginning our hearings next week. We will be travelling over the next four weeks to various parts of the province, beginning next week in the northwest part of the province. In Kenora on Monday we will be at the Royal Canadian Legion hall; in Dryden and Sioux Lookout on Tuesday. In Dryden we will be at the senior citizens' activity centre and in Sioux Lookout at Queen Elizabeth District High School. On Wednesday we will be in Thunder Bay at Lakehead University, and on Thursday in Sault Ste Marie at the Civic Centre.

In the weeks following, we will travel, as I said, throughout other parts of the province, the week of 11 February in Timmins, Sudbury, North Bay, Orillia and Collingwood; the week of 18 February in Toronto, Windsor, London, Kitchener, Brantford and Hamilton, and the last week of February in Ottawa, Cornwall, Kingston, Peterborough and Toronto. That information will obviously, as I indicated earlier, be also made available through the parliamentary channel and people can also get details, again, by calling the 1-800 number, which I hope will also be flashing from time to time across the parliamentary channel. That number is 1-800-668-7275.

I will just conclude by saying that we want to hear from people. The format is really much less relevant. How formal or informal is simply up to the individuals and we will welcome any comments that people have, however structured or unstructured they may be, and encourage people to in fact come and talk with us in any of those locations; or if they not able to do that or do not wish to do that, to take the opportunity to write to us as well here at Queen's Park and give us any views that they may have in writing. Certainly all of our proceedings will be televised, that is the intention, so people are able to follow that as well over the parliamentary channel.

Unless there are any other comments or questions from members of the committee, we will end the public session. If members of the committee could remain for, hopefully, another 10 minutes or so, we can just straighten out some of the technicalities of travelling during the next week.

The committee continued in camera at 1810.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 29 January 1991

Briefing: Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs	C-29
Adjournment	C-40

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Beer, Charles (York North L)
 Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
 Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Cunningham, Dianne E. (London North PC) for Mr Eves

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Murray, Paul, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-4 1991

C-4 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 4 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 4 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Monday 4 February 1991

The committee met at 1327 at the Royal Canadian Legion, Kenora.

The Chair: I would like to call the meeting to order. We will continue the process on the parliamentary channel from different parts of the province. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation and I thought it would be appropriate, given that this is our first meeting, to introduce the members of the committee.

Obviously those people who are sitting here in the audience can see the name tags in front of them, but I think it would be important also for other members who may, as I say, be following these hearings throughout the province, to also see the members of the committee.

From the government side we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, Margaret Harrington, Marilyn Churley, Fred Wilson and David Winninger. From the Liberal Party we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neil and Steven Offer. From the Conservative Party we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick, and also joining us today is the member for Kenora, Frank Miclash. We welcome him as well.

As people may or may not know, our role as a select committee is to report to the Legislature essentially on what the social and economic interests and aspirations of the people of Ontario are within Confederation and also on what form of Confederation can most effectively meet those social and economic aspirations. It is a task that this committee takes rather seriously. It is obviously an issue that is very important to us as a province and as a country because of the discussions that are beginning and will no doubt continue and that have been going on for some time on the whole question of Confederation and the constitutional framework.

I also want to say at the outset that we have been mandated by the Legislature to report with an interim report by 21 March. We then will have time, following that, to pull together a final report for the end of June. I want to emphasize that as far as the committee is concerned we see this first stage of the hearings that we begin today and will carry on throughout the rest of the month as indeed being the first stage of our work.

We know that our discussions will continue in the months leading up to our final report in June and that we will be looking for ways to continue the discussion both with those people who are interested in the various communities and with those communities that we may not have an opportunity to touch base with in this first stage of our hearings.

Before we start to hear the people who have indicated an interest in talking with us, if there are people who are here and wish to speak to the committee who have not submitted their names to us, I would ask you to do that to the clerk as the meeting is proceeding so that we can add

your name to the list and give you an opportunity to talk with us.

Before we proceed with the beginning of the hearings, however, I would like to introduce Alex Skead, who is an Ojibway elder from the Rat Portage Reserve in Lake of the Woods, and who will in effect perform a traditional Ojibway blessing on the proceedings. We thought that was an appropriate way to begin our hearings here in Kenora.

Mr Skead: Thank you very much. I would like to say a few words about the ceremony so that people will understand. The importance of our way of life has been the people. As we believe, a lot of things that the Creator has provided in our lives are still alive. Some of the trees, water and the birds, flying birds and four-legged animals, we always considered those things are our relatives, so this is the reason we are using our pipe ceremonies to offer the spirits that are providing help for us as individuals. This is something that we practised for many, many years and that almost died a few years back.

I was brought up in the traditional way of my father and mother, who are very traditional people. They taught me a lot of things, to respect nature, and that is the reason I am still here. I had almost forgotten the teachings that my native elders have taught me and I am very fortunate that I went back again. As I was going to our natural school, I learned to speak in this language that I am using. I had a hard time to learn, but anyway, I am glad I did. I went through a lot. I went out fishing with a lot of these people who are very important people. I learned a lot of things. I also have been with a lot of these people that are politicians in the province and that is how I learned. I never had that school education, but I learned a lot of good things outside the office.

I was sitting by the window one time when they were having a conference and a policeman walked up to me and said, "What are you doing here?" I said, "I am preparing my agenda." I was looking outside. So that is my agenda. I study the nature. Sometimes I go and sit out on the island to learn something about myself, the importance of a human being. That is why we have these ceremonies, and the drum. I had a dream about the drum. I have another one like that at home which has been passed on from my grandfather. I do not remember him, but my dad taught me a lot about this old man. He was a medicine man. I still carry that drum and I respect it very much.

I was tired and I went to sleep and I had this drum and the other one was hanging up above my bed. I was looking at them and I guess I must have fallen asleep. I was always looking at the drum. It turned out to be an old man and he said, "I am hungry," and I looked at this one here and it turned out to be a young man, just like this gentleman that is sitting there with braids. As I glanced beside my bed,

there were two more drums that came in and they turned out to be men.

Those are the teachings that we learned, to respect the drum. There are drums all over the world. I guess there is a purpose for that. Now when we hit the drum, that drum speaks for the people. Also we sing songs that come from the dream. Like I just said, that drum that turned out to be an old man, he sang a song in which he said, "I'm the one that will be listened to from now on, the spirit." That is the prayer song that we are going to use to open the program in order to help every one of you in this room.

Whatever we do we are working for the future, for our young generation. This is a feeling that I have every time I come to a ceremony. It is the future, the kids. They must not forget that culture, the respect for nature, to love each other and to respect each other regardless what colour we are, what nationality we have. We have to love each other and respect one another and work together. These are the teachings of our Indian people.

Sometimes people will think the ceremonies are too long, but this is part of the teachings that the Creator has given us to live by. So respect Him. He gave us everything to comfort us. This is the reason we give that time to our Creator with a song and also we close off with a song, and that drum will be sitting here until we complete our session, whatever we are going to talk about.

I would like to thank every one of you, gentlemen and ladies, and everybody who is not here to participate. It is a great feeling, it is a great honour for me to be here standing in front of you telling you these words that I experienced in my life.

[Remarks in Ojibway]

That is my saying thanks in the Ojibway language. I am going to sing the song that I heard the drum say: "I'm the one that hears you, that hears the prayers. I'm the one that hears and the spirit hears my prayers."

[Remarks in Ojibway]

The Chair: I appreciate it. Thank you again, Mr Skead. I would like to acknowledge in the audience the presence of the mayor of Kenora, Mayor Winkler, and ask him if he would like to say a couple of words now to us.

Mr Winkler: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, it is indeed a great privilege for me on behalf of the citizens of Kenora to welcome you to the capital of the northwest. We want to take this opportunity to thank our member, Frank Miclash, for advising us of this hearing. We received it on 28 January and council does not always meet and we will not be making a formal presentation, but I never have been known to sit through a meeting without biting my tongue so I will reserve that right as a citizen for later.

Your committee is a very important one. We trust that people are given the opportunity from all walks of life, not just special groups, to hear what people have to say because I feel that your deliberations are going to be the foundation of building a stronger and better Canada, and I think that is what we are looking for. It is something that is going to ensure the future of this country. We wish you well. We know you have a tough task, but let's not have a

report just to government once a year, let's hear from the people. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Mayor. It certainly is our intent to do some of the things you have outlined, and we will welcome you back to the table later on if you so choose.

GIVE PEACE A CHANCE

The Chair: I would like to invite the first two speakers, Peter Kirby and Gisele Spryszak, from the Give Peace a Chance group, to come forward, please. While you are taking your seats, I could just outline that our general rules are to allow groups up to half an hour for presentation, individuals up to 15 minutes. We can be somewhat flexible on that based upon the number of groups coming before us. I would also remind you that we, the members of the committee, would also like to have an opportunity to ask questions of you about some of the things you might say to us, so if you leave some time for that in your presentation, that would be helpful.

Mr Kirby: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the committee. I am very happy to be here to speak on behalf of peace and to take any opportunities I can to do so. I was pleased that Alex Skead was opening the proceedings today because when he passed the peace pipe it reminded me of exactly the kind of feeling we are searching for in today's world.

I would like to open and read you a poem by Edna St Vincent Millay:

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death.

I hear him leading his horse out of the stall; I hear the clatter on the barn floor.

He is in haste; he has business in Cuba, business in the Balkans, many calls to make this morning.

But I will not hold the bridle while he cinches the girth.

And he may mount by himself: I will not give him a leg up.

Though he flick my shoulders with his whip, I will not tell him which way the fox ran.

With his hoof on my breast, I will not tell him where the black boy hides in the swamp.

I shall die, but that is all that I shall do for Death; I am not on his payroll.

I will not tell him the whereabouts of my friends, nor of my enemies either.

Though he promise me much, I will not map him the route to any man's door.

Am I a spy in the land of the living, that I should deliver men to Death?

Brother, the password and the plans of our city are safe with me, never through me

Shall you be overcome.

1350

It is my hope that as individuals and as a community we all have that kind of courage that Edna St Vincent Millay speaks of in that poem.

Our submission is entitled *Dreaming the Impossible Dream: Proposals to Amend the Constitution for Peace*. Kenora Give Peace a Chance is a group of ordinary citizens who have come together to promote peace in the Middle East. The group obtained 1,700 signatures to a petition supporting a negotiated settlement in the Middle East. The group also circulated a questionnaire calling for a response from community leaders in the trimunicipal area to take a stand on behalf of peace in the Middle East. Of the 250 responses collected to date, 90% of respondents agreed to a ban of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Over 75% of respondents agreed to halt the use of Canadian forces in an offensive capacity, to promote a cease-fire which would allow for negotiations and to protect the rights of conscientious objectors.

Kenora Give Peace a Chance has contacted the trimunicipal town councils, the two boards of education, the churches and local Indian bands asking for support of these proposals. In the Kenora Shoppers Mall, which is just about a four-minute walk from here, you will find a table. Volunteers come to sit at this table, distributing handouts concerning the conflict in the Middle East and letters to our Prime Minister requesting a peaceful solution to the crisis. This table also provides a way for people to express their feelings about the war and to share them with the volunteers who sit at the table. When setting up the table each day, the volunteers light several candles. These candles symbolize hope and the continuing vigil which everyone must share through prayer and action on behalf of peace.

Our specific proposals for constitutional amendment stem from our belief that the foundation of Canada's Constitution is peace. Peace is a bond which unites Canadians and commits them to dialogue, harmony and non-violent resolution of conflict. Our Constitution should promote peace and enshrine for Canada the role of peacekeeper. We believe that these following proposals will assist:

A1. That no war be declared or Canadian armed forces used in war without the approval of the Parliament of Canada;

A2. That the decision to declare war or use Canada's armed forces should be made in as democratic a manner as possible and involve provincial and municipal levels of decision-making;

A3. That a vote in the federal Parliament or in provincial legislatures or municipal councils to decide on war or the use of Canada's armed forces should be a free vote and not dictated by party affiliation;

B. That Canada not participate in any war unless a majority of the members of the United Nations General Assembly authorize such participation as part of a United Nations peacekeeping force;

C. That Canada's armed forces be used only in a peacekeeping role and to defend Canada's borders;

D1. That Canada declare itself a nuclear, chemical and biological weapons-free zone;

D2. That Canada prohibit the use, production, sale or testing in Canada of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons;

D3. That Canada work to prevent the use, production, sale or testing of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons throughout the world.

I would like to turn the mike over to Gisele now, who will speak to all of the proposals.

Ms Spryszak: I am also very pleased to have this opportunity to speak. I have found more and more the direction of Canada is changing. I feel that we as Canadian people no longer have input into this decision. When Mr Mulroney came to power, he went to the boardrooms in the United States and told them that Canada was open for business. Part of this openness for Canada was that we would be more militarily involved with the United States. I feel that Canada at one time was a peacekeeping nation and our direction has changed. They speak of a new world order and I question what this means. We are committed as lobby groups to lobby for social and economic reasons. But when it comes to matters of security, a war, the public is determined to be too ignorant and too emotional to have input into this.

We are told to look to our leaders for direction because they know all the aspects of the situation. They have information that we do not have access to. We look to them. What we find is the leader of the superpowers, his diplomacy is basically to kick ass. Our leader more or less rolls the dice. I feel that we have not been able to know the issues.

The issues as I see them are these. In the Middle East the crisis is not about stopping another Hitler. Iraq is a medium-sized, Third World country. The United States chose to support them in the last eight years in the war against Iran. The military machine of Iraq failed so it is not a world-class threat. The issue in the Middle East is also not defending democracy. Iraq and Kuwait are dictatorships. They are run by wealthy oligarchies. They have no intention of changing this form of government. The Middle East crisis is also not about opposing the principles that larger countries must not invade smaller countries.

The United States has shaped the destinies of smaller countries throughout history. Witness the invasion of Grenada, the ravaging of Panama, which was condemned as illegal by the United Nations and also the annihilation of East Timor. The Middle East crisis is also not about maintaining international rule of law. The UN and world court decisions which are supported by the US are often the ones that coincide with US economic interests; for example, the support of Israel to take over Palestine. The UN put out a resolution that Israel withdraw troops. This was ignored by the United States. Also, the US has ignored the world court decision to stop its contra war against the Sandinista government.

The crisis also has little to do with the Gulf policy of opposition to chemical weapons or nuclear proliferation. The US has opposed treaties controlling production and testing of nuclear and chemical weapons. It also approves of nuclear weapons for countries of which it approves. I believe the hypocrisy of righteousness of Canada and the US has gone too far. I have a letter here addressed to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, from the president of the National Council of Development and Peace.

"Barely one year ago you congratulated the American government for its war-like intervention in Panama, which it undertook in contempt of all international law. Moreover, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark responded last year to our organization that more time had to be given to economic sanctions in South Africa to effectively fight against apartheid, and this five years after their institution. Finally, the numerous United Nations resolutions condemning the long-standing occupation by Israel of territories wrongfully taken from Syria and the Palestinians have thus far shown the Canadian government to be rather insensitive."

I believe that Canada, as I have believed for a long time, had a role in the world—we were looked up to for our honour, our integrity and our diplomacy. The Arab coalition has made a petition to the UN that once this war is over, Canada not be used in a peacekeeping role. I believe this war has been presented as a clean, surgical strike, antiseptic. We do not have any idea of the deaths of the civilian people. Our young men and women enlisted in order to defend the boundaries of Canada. They did not enlist in order to go to another country and wage war against men, women and children. The last toll of civilians I have been told who have died is 35,000 people. The Canadian people do not know about this.

1400

I feel that as a peace group, hopefully we can do something to change this, to change the role that our government today is taking towards international relations. We are the greatest resource that a country has, we, the people, and the change will come from us.

Mr F. Wilson: Thank you very much for your presentation. Are you in possession of the document that has been put out, *Changing for the Better*, the discussion paper?

Mr Kirby: No.

Mr F. Wilson: You have no comments on its content at this time?

Mr Kirby: No. We have not received it.

Mr Beer: Thank you for coming before us and offering some thoughts not only on what is happening at the present time in the Gulf, but equally suggestions and recommendations around how a democratic country should make a decision as to whether or not it will enter into a war. While, as you know, we come from the provincial Legislative Assembly and therefore in that context have no direct legislative responsibility, clearly in matters of war and peace we all have concerns and I think very legitimate ones at this point, in terms of how we in the country do decide to get involved.

I would like to ask you two questions with regard to your recommendations. One is that you make clear on page 3, "That Canada not participate in any war unless a majority of the members of the General Assembly of the United Nations authorize such participation as part of a United Nations peacekeeping force." Certainly historically since the UN was founded, one of the key things Canada has always argued is that as a middle-sized country we have to work with other countries in the international field.

The United Nations has been a prime one for us and I think Canada has demonstrated over the years a great deal of leadership there.

How do you deal with the issue where, if the Canadian Parliament voted that we should participate with the United Nations' sanctions and support those and be part of that group, at some point that may mean that the United Nations decides that we must go to war or go into some kind of military action? I take it you would then accept that that was at least legitimate, if people had been consulted in a broader sense and it was part of the United Nations, even though as individuals you might still be very much opposed to that particular action. It is just that what you are calling for here looks at constitutional amendments which in fact could, if you like, underpin any legal approach to Canada's going to war.

I would just like you to expand a bit more on how you see us as part of the United Nations when in fact there would be times, such as in Korea and the present time, when Canada would be involved in a war. How do you come to terms with that, given some of your other statements here?

Mr Kirby: You are right that our proposal is simply that—well, not so simple in this sense. We do not believe that a vote of the security council is sufficient, and this has to do with the present makeup, composition and operation of the United Nations. We believe it has to be a vote of a majority of the members of the General Assembly which would commit Canada to war. We do accept the proposition that once that vote has been made, Canada would have to consider its obligations in the international community, but that is not the final step. The final step would still be a vote by the Parliament of Canada.

I want to emphasize that we are saying that Canada can commit itself to a peace-keeping role or as part of a United Nations joint force, which is not the case in the present war, where basically the United Nations said that after 15 January any country that wishes can declare war on Iraq.

Mr Beer: As a follow-up to the other note that you have in terms of how we can come to that decision, again, if I can just quote you, you say "a vote in the federal Parliament or in provincial legislatures or municipal councils to decide on war." What kind of role do you see municipal councils or provincial legislatures playing in the determination of Parliament's final vote? Have you thought that through? Could you tell me how that would function? You are really talking about wanting to see, I think, more community or direct participation in that decision. What were you thinking of there?

Mr Kirby: One of the things about this war in the Middle East and, I think, about any war today is the potential use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Going to war now, I would submit, is a much more serious proposition than it ever has been in the past. For that reason, I believe that the decision made by Canada to go to war has to be made in a democratic fashion.

We have not fine-tuned a proposal to involve provincial or municipal councils, but in a way we are leaving it to you to think about it, because we believe that perhaps it

should be the decision of not only the federal Parliament but all of the provincial parliaments that would commit Canada to war. It would not be sufficient simply to have a vote at the federal level. We would go further than that and have you consider that perhaps there should be referendums throughout the country at the municipal level in order to assist in making that decision.

Ms Harrington: I would like to thank you for coming. I am very glad that a city like Kenora has a group such as yours that is really willing to get in there and take a definite stand.

I would also like to apologize on behalf of our whole committee that you had not received our discussion paper. We hope that will be out across this province this week. As soon as people get it, hopefully they will look at it. What we have in it are eight questions we are hoping people will look at and discuss. The first question I think you have answered and that is, what are the values we share as Canadians? I think what you have said is a tradition of peace-keeping and peace-loving and justice that we would like to be respected for on the world scene.

What I would like to ask you is, from your very strong position of justice and peace, what do you see as the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?

Ms Spryszak: I feel that the French-English issue has been used to divide Canada. It seems to be a type of psychology that is used throughout the world, because it is the same thing that has been done to the native people. You divide small bands against each other, it weakens them; you divide the Arab people against each other, it weakens them. It has served the same purpose in Canada. Whenever there seem to be economic problems, this issue is brought to the front again. I feel that it has served different governments as a means of weakening people.

1410

Ms Harrington: As you know, at this particular time we are in a crisis almost. How would you see the French-speaking people and the English-speaking people in Ontario and in Canada working together? Do you have any vision of how we could go from this point forward in Canada?

Ms Spryszak: I believe in our policy of bilingualism and multiculturalism. Rather than having one province having more power over the rest of Canada, I think Mr Trudeau's vision of a just society and bilingualism, although at first it caused a lot of unrest, has served more to unite the country. Quebec could feel part of the country as well as the French throughout Canada.

Mr Eves: I would like to follow up with Mr Kirby on a question that was asked by Mr Beer a few moments ago about involving provincial and municipal levels of government in decision-making. You indicated that perhaps a referendum on important issues, such as whether Canada declares war or uses armed force against any other entity or country, might be the most appropriate way of doing that. I wonder if you had given any thought to any other powers that you think a referendum may have a place to play in our role as either provincial or municipal legislators.

Following up on the comments that were just made with respect to the French-language issue in the country today, especially with respect to the province of Quebec in the country today, have you given any thought to whether if you were to hold such a referendum on such an issue, you would require a majority of every province to be able to change one Constitution or adopt a different tack to the Constitution in Canada? Would you require a majority of all municipalities in the country as a whole or in each particular province as a whole?

Mr Kirby: I think that is a very good and also a very tough question. There has been a lot of talk recently about the undemocratic nature of parliamentary government because it does not allow the people of Canada to vote on such important issues as whether we go to war or whether we have a free trade agreement.

It is my belief that there is a role for the use of a referendum in Canadian society, and I believe that on important issues like peace and war, like the sovereignty of Quebec, it would have to be by more than just a passing majority. It would not, for example, in my mind, be sufficient for a majority of the municipal councils in all the provinces except Quebec to vote one way and for less than a majority of the municipal councils in the province of Quebec to vote against. That would not be sufficient. You would have to do a lot of very serious thinking about the referendum, but I do not believe that you can work against the majority of the citizens of one province.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think at this point I have more of a comment than a question because some of the questions I would ask are, I must admit, very tough questions on how to do this. But I want to congratulate you on bringing it to our attention.

I certainly think it is no coincidence and very interesting that our first presentation—and you are the first—would be on the war. When Premier Rae first put this committee together, of course, this was all brewing, but war had not been declared. We were very aware as a committee that if a war were to happen it would certainly to some extent change the balance and the influence on how people are thinking, because a war has such great ramifications for all of us and certainly for us as Canadians. I think many of us are grappling with and being tortured by different opinions on it.

I just want to thank you for bringing it up because I think, as people are watching us today and as we are listening to a lot of presentations, on our minds are the people, our Canadian people and the civilians all over there who are right now in the process of being bombed. No matter what our views on it, I think first on our minds right now is that we want to get it over with as fast as we can.

I guess I could ask you if in fact the fact that a war has started since we decided to start this process has made an impact on how you feel about what is happening in our own country right now.

Ms Spryszak: The fact that war—

Ms Churley: The fact that there is a war. We have been spending quite a bit of time, for obvious reasons, being worried since Meech about where we are going as a

country. I am just wondering if the fact that a war has started has made an impact on how you are now thinking about what we should be doing within our own country.

Ms Spryszak: I feel that the position we have taken in the war represents very much a change that has taken place in Canada and that if Meech Lake had gone through we would be so divided against each other and it would be far easier for free trade to work because provinces would trade with the United States rather than east to west. It seems that with the war we are aligned more and more with the thinking to the south and our sovereignty is being worn away more and more.

OJIBWAY TRIBAL FAMILY SERVICES

The Chair: I would like to invite Josephine Sandy and Colin Wasacase from the Ojibway Tribal Family Services to come and join us. That is a change in the order, for the members of the committee, one of the groups that was going to speak to us this evening.

Mr Wasacase: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. We would like to thank you for the opportunity of making a presentation this afternoon. We also say thanks for the opportunity to the panel and for an opportunity to share with you some of our vision and some of our hopes.

Those are difficult to understand when you come from a non-native perspective. But the value that we hold is the same value that you hold; the value of honesty. If that value of honesty and trying to create some integrity within our world does not happen soon, then we have to begin to worry about what is happening.

I think the value of being able to share—and later this afternoon we hope to present each of you with a small gift—is important in order to develop and to create the kind of change we want, that we share that in an honest and a caring and a loving way. I think those values of care and love are also essential.

I think it is also essential, as we begin to move and develop, to create a world that is going to be peaceful. We have a peaceful group that just preceded us. It is important for us to begin to develop in non-violent ways. The fact is that the kind of image that is created in our Houses, in both the legislative House and the federal House, is on occasion not very conducive to peaceful solutions.

It is time for us to review the importance of all that. This afternoon, Elder Alex Skead shared with you some of his vision and some of his hope, some of his experiences and some of the realities of those values. Each of us stood, those who were Ojibway, because the honour song was sung. You did not understand that. You thought he was chanting something that was different, but if O Canada was played and God Save the Queen, it would have meaning for you. Well, his song had meaning for us. For those who love the bagpipes from the Scottish heritage, that also has meaning. So the drum has meaning.

1420

They sat in four directions because the four directions are important in our world. The drum and the feathers also hold four directions. Those are important in our world. It is important for us then as we meet with you today to sort of share. Those of you who have agendas will notice we are

on again at 7:30 this evening. Again, it is a communication problem.

Someone called it an inquiry, someone called it a commission, someone else called it a constitution. When your office called our office and said that you were having these constitutional meetings, they were under the impression it was an inquiry meeting. So they said, "No, he is busy this afternoon," and we had slated for a 1:30 time. For that reason, we certainly want to thank the French component for allowing us to move in front of them. I think maybe if we could create these kinds of agreements, we would have a better Canada and a more improved world.

The Chair: Indeed.

Mr Wasacase: I would like now to introduce Josephine Sandy. Josephine is the chairperson of the Ojibway Tribal Family Services. She is a mother from Northwest Angle 33 First Nation at the south end of Lake of the Woods. Josephine has been heavily involved in her first nation developing and creating much better opportunities for her people. Her own family are well known, especially one of her daughters, who is a model and is portraying for us an opportunity for what first nations people can do when they have beauty. We certainly feel it is important for us today that we share some of these ideas and I want to conclude with her remarks, I would like to share some others but we may follow with that.

As I say, the time line for us was very short, so we just wanted to give one idea and it pretty well comes out in our presentation this afternoon.

The other person we have is our legal adviser, the other tribe that is lost and looks for other areas, Doug Keshen. It is an opportunity for us to share this time with us. He is our legal adviser for the Ojibway Tribal Family Services.

Mrs Sandy: I am a member of the Northwest Angle 33 First Nation and also the chairperson of the board of directors for Ojibway Tribal Family Services, otherwise known as OTFS. It is in this capacity as chairman of the board of OTFS that I address you today.

OTFS is an Indian-controlled family support organization comprised of 15 first nations within the Treaty 3 region of northwestern Ontario. The following first nations comprise OTFS: Lac Seul, Whitedog, Grassy Narrows, Whitefish Bay, Shoal Lake 39, Shoal Lake 40, Rat Portage, Northwest Angle 33, Eagle Lake, Wabauskang, Wabigoon, Washagamis Bay, Dalles, Northwest Angle 37 and Lac Des Mille Lac.

The chiefs of the 15 OTFS first nations have mandated OTFS to deliver a range of child and family support services that are consistent with our Ojibway Anishinawbe customary care practices. To this extent OTFS is an existing, practising example of Indian government, that is, where first nations assert and maintain jurisdiction and authority over areas of critical importance within our respective reserve communities.

Any redefining of Ontario's role in the Canadian Confederation must acknowledge the justification of different approaches by Anishinawbe first nations. It is not sufficient nor will our first nations accept a delegation of authority from

the Ontario crown over matters in which we Anishinawbe have always had inherent rights and jurisdiction.

Ultimately, of course, it comes down to governments, both federal and provincial, respecting the right to be different and to have different approaches to resolving social and human issues.

OTFS has been developing a self-government process which has key elements which are of primary and essential importance and which must be respected by the Ontario government. They include:

1. The importance of re-establishing customary care practices in harmony with our community traditions;
2. The negotiation of self-government arrangements which will see provincial programs which have been destructive to our traditional customary care programs be done away with;
3. The encouragement and promotion of greater Indian control as it relates to providing support for our families;
4. The acknowledgement of crown Canada's trust responsibility under the Constitution of Canada.

Any redefining of Ontario's role within the Canadian Confederation must acknowledge that our first nations governments possess the inherent authority to structure our family services and support programs and organizations in accordance with Anishinawbe culture and custom and in a manner which respects the needs and priorities of each first nation community.

Premier Rae and Attorney General Hampton have indicated in their statements in the Legislature that they support the process of Indian self-government. They have also indicated that they are open to the concept of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms that will address situations where the non-Indian justice system fails to accommodate the needs of Anishinawbe people.

We firmly believe that the non-Indian provincial courts are not meeting and addressing our needs. We have recently put forward a proposal for the establishment of an Ojibway Anishinawbe tribal family court that will respect our traditional customary care practices. We are anticipating having the support and endorsement of both the federal and provincial governments in enabling our customary care practices and customary laws to be recognized.

Any redefining of Ontario's role in the Canadian Confederation must acknowledge the need and justification for preserving and enhancing the customary care and customary laws of the Ojibway first nations. Without such recognition, we in Ontario would be missing a great opportunity to acknowledge the diversity within our province, and ultimately to constitutionally entrench the right of indigenous peoples within the province of Ontario to maintain our Ojibway culture and customary practices.

In other words, for the redefining of Ontario's future role within the Canadian Confederation, uppermost in everyone's mind should be the recognition of the importance of respecting the diversity and right of all indigenous peoples, including the Ojibway within the OTFS first nation communities, to preserve their customary care practices and identity.

If an amendment to our Constitution is required to entrench these fundamental principles, then we encourage

our legislators to proceed deliberately and with confidence to entrench these rights.

It all comes down to mutual respect.

Thank you very much. Meegwetch.

1430

Mr Wasacase: I would just like to add that indeed the entrenchment of aboriginal rights is very essential. We also feel it is important to recognize aboriginal linguistic rights and to begin that recognition as an important factor. As studies have shown, in Canada there are only three major language groups that will maintain at the rate of loss at the present time, and one of them is the Ojibway, which is very strong, with the Cree and the Inuit.

We are saying that if we are going to maintain any strength within the only lands we know called Canada or North America or Turtle Island, as by some people, linguistic rights must be recognized. We talk about our cultural rights in the paper. We talk about our inherent rights.

The other aspect that we feel is important is the lands question. We do not want them to go any further than the fact that elders indicate to us that the land is a loan to us from the Creator. We have difficulty in talking about some ownership on that aspect, and that is where we get into the argument with the legalistic people, that everybody feels some strength when he owns the land because he paid \$90,000. They put a dollar value on it and it is important for them because then they have a stake, but that, for us, is the idea that land is only a part of where we disappear to when we are finished on this created earth.

The last aspect that we want to make sure is understood is that there is an opportunity for our first nations women and children who have much difficulty as a result of being able to move into a community that does not recognize them only as people, because they are different and because they somehow make some changes in order to make themselves much more acceptable in the world, and sometimes that means many difficult things. I realize that in your booklet you indicate a lot of percentages there, things that indicate the social disintegration, the tremendous poverty line, the lack of water, the lack of housing, the lack of economic opportunity.

But I think it is important that we have an opportunity of recognizing these people, real people of renewal, that under Bill C-31 at the federal level for the first time native women began to be recognized as people of equal rights as everyone else. I think it is important to continue that process, so it is those added comments.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation. I think it strikes a very positive and responsive chord among all the members of the committee. There are a number of questions that people want to raise and I will try to get around to everyone.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: May I thank you, first of all, for your last statement. As a woman on this committee, I deeply appreciate the remarks that you made on behalf of your own women and on the broader Ontario women, and for your sensitivity. I really do not have any questions. I am going to do a lot of thinking about what you have said. You said you had one point to make; I have found many. I

guess what I would like to say is that it is so wonderful to be here among you. Often you have been among us at Queen's Park. I am very happy that you can bring so many more of your people here today.

I see what you are saying about the family and it certainly has been one of my mission statements, if we want to use those big words, that we have the parents as the prime educators. I think you have reminded us today that this is certainly what you are wanting to do, whether it be in education or whether it be through the court system or whether it be actually in the care of the family when it is in need. I deeply appreciate the way in which you have shown your sensitivity to that which we can understand and that which we cannot understand, when we do not come from your community.

I feel you have started us off on a very positive note, as have the other presenters, and I must acknowledge that Kenora has really given us a kickoff here that you can be proud of. You have talked to us about respecting. You mentioned that word many times and I think that is what we will have to carry through with this as we go across the province. You answered the questions in our booklet. You teased about the values that are important to you and they are very explicit values of honesty, caring and loving, which we can all understand, which are much harder to carry forth.

All I can do is really congratulate you for your presentation. I really do feel it has been a deep insight. I have had a little bit of work on alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and I think there is an awful lot for us all. I am very pleased that you are working on it in this community and beyond. I could say a lot more to you, but there are many other members who want, I am sure, to talk to you in the very same vein as I am. I appreciate your humour as well.

Mr Winninger: I too would like to thank you for sharing your Ojibway experience with us today, particularly in the family services area. We have all heard stories of children being taken out of their native communities and culture, horrifying stories of children being uprooted and exposed to mental and physical abuse in non-native facilities. I would agree with you that it is time that native self-respect and ownership of these facilities be restored.

You probably heard about the strong commitment that our Premier, Bob Rae, as well as our minister responsible for native affairs, Bud Wildman, have made towards negotiating self-government agreements with native communities, even bilateral agreements where the federal government does not choose to participate. So I certainly applaud your initiative and we as a government look forward to working with you further towards realizing your objectives.

Mr Harnick: What specific mechanisms would best help you to deliver the family services that your organization delivers in terms of a Constitution that this committee is now wrestling with? What kinds of things must be done in order to facilitate the work you wish to continue with?

Mr Wasacase: We talk about government; we talk about governing. It only leads to say that as a first nation is to be recognized as that. Once you are recognized as a

government and a governing group, then at least you have an opportunity of beginning to move with laws and customary care practices that have been in existence for thousands of years. It is only most recently that we have had Europeans join us with their laws and their rules. All that we are saying now is to at least recognize that we had those in place prior to now and to try to melt that into existing practices that have existed and have been sort of accepted over the years since the Europeans gathered with first nations people.

Mr Harnick: Without beating around the bush—

Mr Wasacase: We sometimes have to do that

Mr Harnick: No, we do not want you to do that. Without beating around the bush, the fact of the matter remains that I do not think, as of today, the first nations in this country and certainly in this province would be satisfied with anything less than a specific entrenchment in the Constitution of the right to native self-government.

Mr Wasacase: That is right.

1440

Mr Harnick: It seems to me that would be the starting point in terms of land negotiation, family programs. Would you agree with that?

Mr Wasacase: We state that in our paper as an opportunity to move in that direction.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your very important presentation, specifically in recognition of the need for love and caring, as well as honesty, and the preservation of your culture. Looking at your own native self-government, it seems to me that you would like us to recognize your own self-government, but how would you like us to recognize the self-government? How would you like to see that included in the Constitution? Do you want a separate constitution or would you like to see the first nations as part of our Constitution?

Mr Wasacase: First nations people have never said they did not want to. For us to state that now would be difficult because we would have to get Canada to build a few more ships than it has built and sent to the Persian Gulf to move you back. The fact is that we have to begin to develop mechanisms that will allow us to gain and be recognized for the laws that we have, for the roles and the kinds of actions that were important to us, as first nations people, for many years.

How we fit these into existing laws and rules is the opportunity of governments—we are talking here about first nations—dialoguing with people so that the best kinds of solutions can be found, not only in Ontario but in Canada, and that first nations people again can have the same pride and the same kinds of feelings of kindness that were given to your forefathers who came over to look for another world, to look for another life and to look to another future and another vision.

I think all of you here today are moving on that type of voyage to develop, in order for us to have a world for our children, a world which will have all the values that I shared with you, and that each of them can hold out his hand and that we can grasp those hands not in anger and

hatred, not in violence, but our hands can be held out together, together, the circle that we talk about, and that we can be strengthened by that. We hope that self-government will be part of all that process, when we talk about it.

Mr Malkowski: Basically you would like to recognize your right of self-government, that it be shared equally and have mutual respect, so very clearly that would be put in the Constitution, but basically that is what you would like, a recognition of your own self-government.

Mr Offer: Let me first thank you very much for your presentation. I think it clearly brings forward a number of very important values, some things which we in the committee are certainly going to have to grapple with.

On the basis of your presentation, there is no question at this point in time that there are a number of provincial and federal committees doing work in this area. Certainly there is work being done in Quebec dealing with some of the rights, rules and responsibilities they now want to have which are now part of some federal jurisdiction.

In your presentation you have spoken about, and have repeated a number of times, the redefinition of Ontario's role in the Canadian Confederation; a very important statement, especially what follows after that particular statement.

Is it your position that the interests you have brought forward in this document are ones which should be kept in mind by the province of Ontario in its role of looking at a redefined Confederation, or is there a role which the first nations people should play directly in dealing with your rights and roles under the Constitution?

I wonder if you can just help me as to where you feel first nations should be in this process.

Mr Wasacase: I think the process is the same as talking to your mother-in-law. I mean, you would not like your brother-in-law to speak on your behalf to your mother-in-law. I think you would like direct access to that lady and tell her how proud you are of the woman she gave you.

I think we are of the same process. We would like direct access to developing the kinds of rules and regulations that are important to us. I think it is also important that there be simultaneous workings with different levels of governments to review the various impacts that changes may make as a result of these recognitions of inherent responsibility.

I do not know if it helps here any. I think, as my friend Mr Harnick said, we continue to beat around the bush, but the rabbits come out pretty soon.

Mr Offer: Yes, I think we are coming to the rabbits actually and that is what I want and I thank you very much for that response. I think it is important, certainly for this committee's knowledge, to get a full appreciation as to where you view your role in this process and I think that will probably be a recurring theme, but I am very pleased that it is brought out on the very first day, actually. Thank you.

Mr Harnick: In terms of whom you would prefer to deal with, we now have a situation where there are certain areas of provincial jurisdiction and provincial negotiations that the native communities have to deal with; they also have to deal with the Indian Act and federal jurisdiction.

In a new Constitution, even assuming the opportunity to have self-government written into that Constitution in areas of funding, taxation, land claims, social services, what would be the preference of the first nations in terms of which level of government they deal with, or do you continue to deal with both levels of government?

Mr Wasacase: I guess we do not have much choice but to continue to deal with both the federal and the provincial now that we have the opportunity as first nations people because of treaties and those rights of treaties which were signed in the late 1800s and some earlier than that. But it is important for first nations people to deal directly with first nations people and I am saying with governments, and that is federal and at the present time provincial. So those have to continue.

1450

Mr Harnick: Let me put this to you. If a provincial government came along and said, "We would take over the whole jurisdiction of native affairs rather than divide it with the federal government," would that be acceptable to you?

Mr Wasacase: I would not know what that meant. Do you know what that means?

Mr Harnick: I have an inkling, but I have to be honest, I probably do not know very much more than you do. But if someone came along and said: "Look, there is too much three-way dealing here. It would be much more simple if we had two-way dealing."

Mr Wasacase: The Ojibway Tribal Family Services has taken the mandate to do a bilateral agreement with the federal government and they maintain that present mandate. That is why we are looking at alternative resolutions in relationship to the tribal court system.

The Chair: Okay. I know there are other questions, but we do have other groups we want to hear from as well.

Mr Wasacase: Before we leave, we just want to say thank you very much for the opportunity of sharing with you, and because we want to share with you we have a set of paddles which we use as a symbol; in this area the first nations people live on water and our method or mode of transportation has always been water. The paddles represent the idea that as we present these to you, you share the opportunity of paddling our little canoe, which is the self-government canoe, together. This is the reason for it, so we hope that you will enjoy these.

The Chair: I know, as was noted, you did cover a number of points in your presentation, but certainly, if you have additional comments you want to develop over the next few weeks and send to us, feel free to do that as well. Thank you very much, Mr Wasacase.

LE CLUB CHANTECLERC

M. le Président : J'invite maintenant Émile Blouin, Marielle Benson et Francine Petiquan du Club Chanteclerc.

M. Blouin : Je vais vous adresser la parole en français. I hope my compatriots from Kenora will forgive

me. Those of you who do not understand French will pardon me, but I have a principle involved here.

Alors, je tiens à vous remercier de m'avoir invité à cette conférence. Vraiment, c'est ma première présentation en français dans la ville de Kenora. J'en ai fait quand j'étais professeur de français au niveau secondaire, mais c'était la première fois que je le fais publiquement.

Je vais vous parler au nom du Club Chanteclerc, qui est un petit club social qui existe ici à Kenora depuis assez longtemps, depuis 1970, je crois, mais je voudrais vous parler aussi comme individu, vous donner un peu de mon histoire, mon histoire de Canadien.

Je suis le porte-parole d'un petit groupe et je dois vous expliquer, excusez, M^{me} Petiquan a des problèmes à la maison. Elle a une assez grande famille. M^{me} Benson était ici avec moi depuis deux heures mais elle a dû nous quitter parce qu'elle est infirmière à l'hôpital et elle doit recommencer à trois heures. Alors, j'ai à côté de moi Claire Theriault.

M. le Président : Je dois demander un instant.

For members of the public who are interested, there are translation devices available at the back of the hall. If there are people who would like to make use of those, please feel welcome to do that.

M. Blouin : Qui sommes-nous ? Nous sommes multiculturels, oui. Mais, plus que ça, en y pensant, nous sommes les ancêtres d'un peuple qui n'a pas voulu disparaître, qui n'a pas voulu mourir. Nous sommes Canadiens et Canadian. Je me sens tellement les deux. Au passage des années — et prenez compte de notre placement géographique dans le nord-ouest de l'Ontario — les deux langues et les deux cultures sont arrivées.

Qu'est qu'il y a dans notre communauté francophone ? Elle n'est pas grande ; elle est très petite. Il y a celle de la francophonie ontarienne, il y a celle du Vieux-Québec, que je représente parce que je suis Québécois d'origine et il y a celle des Franco-Manitobains. La majorité des francophones dans la région de Kenora, Fort Frances etc sont des Franco-Manitobains qui viennent du Manitoba. Avant tout, nous sommes Canadiens ; pas vraiment Français. Nous représentons, sur un tableau plus étendu, le Canada français au sein de l'Ontario.

Je sais qu'on a besoin de se refranchir — M. Bisson en a parlé il n'y a pas longtemps — de retrouver nos racines, retrouver notre langue, retrouver notre culture. C'est une chose que beaucoup parmi nous ont perdu. On est un peuple peu nombreux. La plupart parmi nous sont assimilés. Jusqu'ici, il reste seulement les noms de famille. Dans notre ville, il y a des Desjardins, des Dufresne, des Desgagné, des Plante, des Lajeunesse, des Lafranière, mais ils parlent tous anglais ; ils ne parlent plus français. Leur héritage, plus ou moins, est disparu. Il reste seulement le nom et peut-être la religion ; la langue est disparue. Voilà la tragédie, vraiment, la culture d'origine submergée.

Est-ce que nous sommes morts de honte nous les francophones ou bien est-ce que c'est un manque de soin ? Je crois, du fond de mon cœur, que c'est un manque de soin. On n'a pas été assez soignés et nous n'avions pas les outils pour commencer, pour progresser à un niveau plus élevé.

On ne nous a rien garanti au commencement dans la province de l'Ontario.

Comment suis-je devenu, personnellement, Ontarien ? Vous voyez que je suis assez vieux, d'un certain âge ; je suis déjà professeur à ma retraite. J'ai l'esprit jeune quand même. L'Ontario a été bonne pour moi, pour ma famille, pour mes parents. Nous sommes venus du Québec et une fois traversé la frontière, vous m'avez nié ma langue et ma culture et mes chansons.

Je suis arrivé à l'âge de sept ans à Sault Sainte-Marie, unilingue. Je n'avais jamais entendu parler un mot d'anglais. J'étais dans une mer anglophone où les institutions étaient anglophones : les cours, les cours de loi, les églises, les écoles, les marchés, l'économie, tous en anglais, et moi, nous, une famille du Canada... Attention, moi et ma famille, nous n'étions pas des étrangers, des étrangers. On se sentait souvent comme tel ; nous étions des Canadiens depuis 1742.

Les Blouin sont arrivés sur l'île d'Orléans, au Québec, de la France en 1742. Il y en a maintenant des milliers à travers le Canada. Il y a en encore sur l'île d'Orléans, pas loin de la ville de Québec. Mes parents sont nés à Saint-Jean-d'Orléans, mais c'est une autre histoire et bon Dieu, Saint-Jean-d'Orléans est encore là.

1500

Pour survivre dans mon propre pays, mon pays adopté, l'Ontario, et plus tard prospérer, j'ai dû apprendre l'anglais or else — très bien — ce que j'ai fait avec rapidité et avec plaisir. J'avais maintenant deux cultures, deux langues, deux héritages et j'en suis fier. Soyez convaincus que je suis fier d'avoir les deux cultures. I am proud of having both cultures. I belong to both and I feel quite at home in both.

Il n'y avait pas de place pour les deux dans l'Ontario que je connaissais. On vivait en français à la maison mais totalement en anglais en dehors du domicile parce qu'il n'y avait pas de choix quand plus tard nous sommes allés à Toronto. J'ai passé 18 ans de ma vie à Toronto. Ma première lecture en français, c'était peut-être la faute de mes parents, mais c'était à Vaughan Road Collegiate à Toronto, grade 9 French. Je parlais beaucoup mieux français que mon professeur, une certaine M^{lle} Prior, si je me rappelle. Elle a dit, «Blouin, vous parlez bien mais vous ne savez pas écrire ni lire le français.» Ça nous fait drôle dans notre propre pays d'avoir une chose comme ça arriver. Mais à qui la faute ? J'ai pensé hier soir aux deux solitudes qui existaient ; elles existent encore les deux solitudes mais ça commence à se dissiper.

La première fois à l'Université de Toronto en 1950, j'avais lu les «Two Solitudes» de Hugh MacLennan, un miracle pour moi parce que j'étais tellement isolé. J'étais à l'Université de Toronto mais on me croyait plutôt Français de France, vous savez ? Je faisais à ce temps-là un peu de théâtre et je me rappelle que le professeur a dit, «Ah ! Vous avez un accent cayayen». Très bien, miracle, écrivain anglophone me décrivait. Moi, le héros de ce roman, Paul, avait osé sortir de on petit monde québécois et lancer un défi à l'établissement anglophone. Mais je reviens à mon pays et à ma province qui est l'Ontario.

Je remercie du fond de mon cœur le gouvernement de l'Ontario, sa générosité et largesse envers la communauté francophone et ça s'améliore... Je me rappelle avoir écouté M. Beer qui parle très bien français. Je vous félicite, Monsieur Beer, d'avoir appris notre langue. J'en suis présentement témoin dans mon rôle sur l'exécutif de l'AFNOO, Association francophone du Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario, qui est située à Thunder Bay. Mais pour ma génération perdue, il n'y avait rien pour nous dans l'Ontario anglophone. Sink or swim, c'était ça. Vos politiciens, vos institutions nous ont nié le droit de vivre en français, nous ont nié le droit de rire en français, de jouer en français, d'élever une famille en français; est-ce que je pourrais dire faire l'amour en français? Non, je ne crois pas.

J'étais devenu un Ontarien pure laine, comme on dit, après tout, et n'étais-je pas toujours un Canadien, a Canadian? Ce n'était pas le génocide mais c'était la coercition, à mon avis. Y-a-t-il une solution? Je crois que oui, et elle réside dans les forces et la vision de l'Ontario et ses citoyens, la plus grande et la plus puissante des dix provinces du Canada. Mais il faut que ce soit un Ontario qui respecte la dualité linguistique déjà fragilement établie dans la province.

Après 350 ans d'histoire dans votre province, au pays du Haut-Canada, vous nous devez les mêmes droits qu'ont les autres groupes qui font partie de notre province. Maintenant que le bon travail de reconstruction et de réconciliation est en pleine vigueur, nous espérons pouvoir continuer à vivre en français n'importe où dans la province. Et j'ai ici à côté de moi M^{me} Theriault, qui vient de l'Acadie, au Nouveau-Brunswick et elle est maintenant Franco-Ontarienne, si vous voulez.

And finally, to end my talk—I want to be polite and I want to show that I believe in duality—I shall turn to my second language, my adopted language. I understand full well, as well as any of you, why Quebec reacts as it does within Confederation in 1991. One half million francophones living and working in Ontario need to be assured of their place in the scheme of things, because it was not always assured. We were the drawers of water and the hewers of wood. Je l'ai, Monsieur Bisson?

What has happened in the last two decades must be allowed to grow and expand as part of the heritage of all francophones and the hundreds of thousands of us who have been lost to the French community through assimilation. You have no idea of the number of francophones. I think it is tragic. A lot of them probably do not. I really do. They could have had two cultures, two languages, and they do not. Time has wrought its changes upon us, but this seems to happen to linguistic minorities in general.

I will not go into detail now; however, the key to the survival of the francophone, and to everyone for that matter, but especially the French, must be education. I say that as an educator: education which ranges from the small classes for the functionally illiterate, of which there are already a few in northern Ontario now in place, through to the elementary school system, the secondary and the post-secondary. We must continue to educate and to train for tomorrow with the wholehearted support of the province.

Of prime importance is that the francophone should be allowed to take his education in his own language. There is the rub at certain levels, especially at the post-secondary level, plus in other areas of social services within the province of Ontario. The education will come from our schools naturally, from our libraries, from the media, from the culture and the arts and from our social services. Education has improved immensely, but a lot of these services, in the language that we should be entitled to use, have been denied us up to now.

We are not hard done by in any way, but there is a certain hidden agenda I suppose, or there used to be, in the suppression of French in Ontario. Where does Ontario, in a more general sense, fit into the puzzle that is Canada and Confederation? Well, Ontario has a key role to play, un rôle clef, the role of a benevolent judge in order to offset the threat of a separate or a sovereign Quebec. Only the economic and social strength of Ontario, I feel, can guarantee a renewed federalism. You are a key province in the coming deliberations with the rest of Canada. I cannot, as an individual, nor can we as a group in a place like Kenora envisage a fractured federal state. I am a Canadian as well as a Canadian, and maybe I could no longer be a Canadian if Quebec were to declare itself a sovereign state.

It remains part of a giant puzzle. I think that you as politicians at higher levels in Ontario could offset the outworn clichés and the tired politicians who now carry—I am thinking of the federal level especially, if you will excuse me—a sort of a pejorative name as politicians because of what has taken place. I think of Meech Lake in particular and the fiasco it became.

Ontario can show the way by declaring—and it has up to a point up to now—that the francophone, the anglophone communities, as well as the native communities, les autochtones du Canada, and also the multicultural communities—I am not here to discuss all these but I mention them because they are important—have equal status across our fair province.

We have all become a part of the warp and woof—it is an expression I like that I picked up in an English course—of our society. But we demand qualitative changes: quality in education, quality in social services, quality of politicians, upright, upstanding, honest, fair play—right, Frank?—all these sort of things. Okay. I am trying to be funny, not facetious.

I think Ontario will counteract the federal dictatorship that now rules Canada, and I mention that as a footnote, I guess. I have felt that for some time.

1510

Je voudrais terminer, si vous me donnez la permission, en français, quelques petits mots seulement. Je pleure pour mon pays en ce moment critique dans son histoire. Je suis certain que les citoyens et les citoyennes de l'Ontario et leur gouvernement vont prendre un rôle de leadership, de guides, dans les nouvelles définitions de notre pays. Mon pays, ce n'est pas un pays, c'est une réalité qui va survivre ses défauts. Je vous remercie de m'avoir prêté l'oreille.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Blouin. Il y aura sans doute des questions.

M. Beer : Merci pour votre présentation. Je pense qu'il est très intéressant que durant cette première journée on nous a parlé d'abord de la paix, deuxièmement des autochtones, des droits et maintenant vous nous parlez des francophones. Donc, petit à petit, on commence à construire ou reconstruire ce qu'est le pays, le Canada.

Je pense que l'une des questions importantes pour ce comité et surtout peut-être pour les communautés minoritaires de langue française dans notre pays c'est le fait que, aujourd'hui, on se rend compte qu'au Québec il y a un mouvement, beaucoup de discussions — comment définir exactement ce qui arrive — mais où, peut-être pour la première fois, l'option du séparatisme, l'option d'une sorte d'association-souveraineté, ces options sont vraiment discutées et où nous tous, Canadiens, ne savons pas exactement où on va. En effet, un des buts de notre comité c'est d'essayer de voir ce que les Ontariens et Ontariennes pensent de notre pays et où nous allons.

Je pense que ça peut être utile pour nous si vous, en tant que francophone, qui depuis longtemps habitez l'Ontario, nous disiez comment vous voyez la réaction du Québec dans le contexte où, en Ontario, on essaie d'obtenir plus de services en langue française, de développer vraiment une politique disons du bilinguisme, où on peut assurer aux francophones comme aux anglophones un certain droit de base pour les services gouvernementaux. Mais on a en même temps un certain sens que de plus en plus, pour le Québec ça n'a pas un grand intérêt, que la province de Québec préfère maintenant dire, «Écoutez, nous voulons construire notre propre pays.»

Alors dans ce contexte-là, quelles sont les suggestions que vous pourriez partager avec nous en dialoguant avec les Québécois ? Et aussi, quel est le rôle des francophones de l'Ontario ? J'admets, je comprends et je suis d'accord que notre province a un rôle très important à jouer avec le Québec mais pourtant, quel est le rôle des francophones de notre province dans un dialogue avec le Québec ? Qu'est-ce que nous pouvons faire pour convaincre le Québec que c'est peut-être la meilleure chose pour nous deux de rester ensemble dans un pays ? Peut-être qu'on a des différences aujourd'hui mais quand même c'est un pays qui est fort. Si vous pouvez répondre à cela alors notre travail sera fini.

M. Blouin : Vous avez raison, Monsieur Beer. Je ne comprends pas — le Québec qui existe aujourd'hui, ça ne fait pas partie de ma vie vraiment. Je retourne au Québec de temps à autre. Je voudrais dire que ça a beaucoup changé. Les Québécois de mon âge, plus ou moins, demeurent Canadiens parce que nous avons été élevés comme ça, mais je suis convaincu et je sais que les jeunes Québécois, ceux entre 15 ans et 30 ans, ont décidé qu'ils en ont eu assez du Canada anglais, des anglophones. Ils veulent régler leur propre pays qu'ils vont faire eux-mêmes. Ils sont certains d'eux-mêmes. Ils savent où ils vont, ils sont certains de réussir.

Moi, je ne comprends pas ça. Pour ceux-là, je crois qu'on n'a pas écouté d'assez près et avec assez de sincérité il y a 30 ans, il y a 20 ans. Mais qu'est-ce qu'ils veulent ces gars-là du Québec ? Pourquoi est-ce qu'ils chialent, comme on dit ? Pourquoi se plaignent-ils ? Qu'est-ce qu'il

y a qui ne va pas ? On n'a pas voulu comprendre le Québécois. On ne s'intéressait pas à le comprendre, il n'était pas tellement important. Mais on voit aujourd'hui qu'il est très important parce que s'il part, notre voisin québécois, le Canada va être beaucoup plus pauvre, je vous en assure.

En même temps, qu'est-ce qu'il va nous arriver à nous, comme moi, qui sommes en Ontario depuis plus de 50 ans, qui avons nos racines et nos sources encore au Québec d'une certaine manière ? Je ne le sais pas, mais je crois que nous sommes sur le bon chemin dans la province. Vous avez assez d'écoles françaises maintenant, de conseils scolaires pour francophones, vous parlez d'un collège du Nord pour les francophones. Il y a beaucoup de choses qui se passent maintenant qui nous assurent, nous, les francophones, que l'Ontario, même si le Canada se dégage — je ne sais pas ce que je dirais à part cela — nous avons assez de choses dans nos institutions qui vont garantir nos droits. Nous sommes beaucoup plus certains, plus sûrs de nous-mêmes que nous l'étions il y a 50 ans, je vous en assure. Un jeune homme comme M. Bisson pourra certainement vous assurer que j'ai raison. Il est beaucoup plus jeune que moi. Est-ce que j'ai commencé à répondre à votre question ?

M. Bisson : Je pense possiblement que vous demeurez dans ma circonscription.

Moi, la question que je demande, c'est que vous avez dit justement tout à l'heure qu'une des affaires qui est très importante c'est de ramener le monde ensemble, d'être capable de regarder à chacun sa position, parce que sans ça c'est pas mal difficile de savoir où on va s'en aller dans les négociations constitutionnelles. Moi, je parle comme Franco-Ontarien. De quelle manière peut-on prendre ce défi-là d'être capable de faire réaliser les gens que oui, il y a des différences ? Bien, c'est la différence qui nous amène ensemble, c'est ça qui est notre sorte. De quelle manière pensez-vous qu'on peut se dégager sur ce point-là ?

M. Blouin : La première chose c'est qu'il est question d'accepter la différence. Pour un certain pourcentage de notre population, ils ne l'acceptent pas. Ils veulent être unilingues, uniculturels, je ne sais pas. C'est très difficile.

Peut-être que ça remonte à 1759, quand la France a perdu le Canada. Peut-être que ça remonte à cette époque-là mais je crois que c'est plus fondamental que ça. Si vous parlez une autre langue, que vous parlez une deuxième langue, c'est le fait que vous pensez un peu différemment, c'est le fait que vous vous amusez un peu différemment. Vous êtes différent. Il y a une certaine psychologie qui s'attache à une langue. C'est cette psychologie et cette différence qu'ils ne comprennent pas.

Mais il y a des milliers de English-speaking Canadians qui nous comprennent, qui veulent garder la dualité, mais il y en a des milliers aussi qui ne le veulent pas. Ils voient dans les demandes du Québec, ils comprennent seulement que ce sont des demandes politiques et que ce sont des demandes économiques. Ils ne comprennent pas la nature culturelle, la nature sociale et la nature linguistique de ces demandes. Il est très important que le Québec survive. Il y a en beaucoup dans la province de Québec qui sont convaincus qu'ils ne survivront pas dans le contexte du Canada

comme il est à l'heure actuelle, comme le Canada est construit à l'heure actuelle. C'est dommage, ils ont peut-être raison, mais ça me rend très triste d'y penser.

J'espère que nous allons pouvoir sauver notre pays et aujourd'hui je crois que c'est un commencement. Est-ce que j'ai répondu, Gilles, plus ou moins ?

1520

M. Bisson : Oui.

Une dernière question : c'est quoi qu'on dit comme francophone à ceux dans le pays qui disent, «Écoute, pour que le Canada survive, c'est très important qu'on demeure seulement une nation»? Il n'y a pas seulement les francophones, il y a les autochtones et toutes sortes d'autres gens dans le pays. Mais qu'est-ce qu'on dit à ceux qui disent qu'ils ont une vision du pays seulement unilingue, avec seulement une race dans le pays ?

M. Blouin : Je pourrais commencer par dire que s'il y a une division dans notre pays, le beau Canada, on va devenir... Vous, surtout vous qui êtes anglophones ou qui n'êtes pas francophones, vous allez devenir, dans 100 ans, des Américains. C'est ça que vous allez devenir très vite, surtout dans l'Ouest du Canada à mon avis personnel. Ça va arriver. Je ne sais pas si ça va être citoyens des États-Unis, mais vous allez devenir Américains.

Mais si on reste ensemble, si on peut former cette dualité, si le monde peut comprendre comment c'est important d'avoir les deux langues et peut-être une troisième langue, d'être un pays bilingue ou trilingue, quoique ce soit, si on vient à comprendre ça et si on vient à accepter certaines demandes que nous pose le Québec, on va rester ensemble. À ce moment-là, on va devenir très fort et on ne deviendra pas des Américains.

Mr Eves: I would like to thank you very much for what I think is a very impassioned and sincere presentation here this afternoon. I would like to seek some advice from you, however.

Mr Blouin: Any time.

Mr Eves: How would you respond to Quebec's recent proposal with respect to restructuring of the federation or Confederation of Canada certainly, I think, as you and I have come to know it? Many people have suggested that it would drastically reduce the powers that our current federal government has, and some say that it in fact will destroy Canada as you and I know it.

I would like to know how you respond to their proposal, bearing in mind that just a few short months ago it would appear that the rest of Canada, at least two and perhaps three provinces, could not agree on five demands and now we appear to be presented with a checklist, depending on who is counting, of up to as many as 22.

You mentioned earlier in your presentation, and I was struck by it, about we in Ontario having economic and social strength. I was wondering what you think that we specifically can do in the province of Ontario in that regard to respond to the proposal that the province of Quebec appears to be making and what you think of its proposal.

Mr Blouin: Can I go back to your original question about the demands of Quebec? I suppose, because I have lived here 30 years in Kenora, I have remained a strong

federalist. I believe in a strong federal government, as long as I believe in that government, mind you. NDP people will appreciate that, I suppose. I have remained a federalist and I really do not want to even think of the day that Quebec would separate.

I think what is emanating from Quebec at the moment is politics. It is a pose. I have never trusted Mr Bourassa and I trust less yet M.—but I am showing my colours here, am I not? I think it is politics they are playing. They are playing a very dangerous game, mind you, but they have got a lot of push behind them. They are not the separatist party. That belongs to Jacques Parizeau. We can thank our lucky stars we are not dealing with him.

I think they will back off but I think the key to the negotiations, whatever is going to take place in the next few months, will come from Ontario. I really believe that. What can Mr Rae and his government, with the help of everyone else, come with in Ontario to counteract and mollify some of these demands?

For the second part of your question, I strongly believe in a government that is concerned with its people and has social structures in place, unemployment insurance, health insurance, all these things from which we benefit. I certainly believe that even if we were to split up, these things would continue to be a part of the Canadian tradition.

But I certainly notice, in the year since the free trade agreement was signed, that a lot of these little things, bit by bit, are being eroded. The Americans speak of a level playing field. "Your workers have too many things going for them. They have too much health insurance. They have unemployment insurance." I think it is very important that we maintain those.

I might express to you that that kind of thing is very strong among the francophones. They strongly believe in these sort of social benefits. It is strongly inherent in the society of Quebec as well, which probably would be a mild social democratic type of government even to this day, but even the Bloc québécois.

Again, the key is the province of Ontario and the second key to the survival of Canada is education, especially education of quality at the secondary level and at the post-secondary level in particular. We have done a good job of that, and hopefully it will pay off with informed and insightful citizens. Have I answered your question or not? I beat around the bush. I forgot the last part.

Mr Eves: You forgot the last presenter, beating around the bush. No, I am just kidding. I think you have certainly addressed some of the issues, perhaps not as specifically as I would like to. Perhaps I am expecting you to provide us with a lot of instant answers when we all know that there are not any. I think that you have answered the question by saying that really the province of Ontario can play a very lead role by demonstrating understanding towards mollifying some of the representations coming from Quebec.

Mr Blouin: I hope you will listen to them carefully. Listen carefully and find out what is in their heads.

The Chair: On that note, thank you. There are a number of other questions but time does not permit us to get

into them. I apologize to the members of the committee. Thank you very much.

DON IMBEAU

The Chair: Can we call Don Imbeau, please?

Mr Imbeau: I am not sure I can go through with this. It is a bit scary.

Mr Bisson: We have all had to do this at one time.

The Chair: We have been called a lot of things, but intimidating I am not sure.

Mr Imbeau: Good afternoon, Mr Chairman and committee members. For the record my name is J. Donald Imbeau. I am a Franco-Ontarian, born and raised in Blind River, which is located on the north shore of Lake Huron, migrated to Toronto, remained for a dozen years, migrated to northwestern Ontario, which is now my permanent residence.

I am currently president of the Multicultural Association of Kenora and District. I am also a member of the board of directors for the Kenora Community Legal Clinic. I am a member of a newly formed race relations council in Kenora. I am also a Mormon, a member of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. I mention these facts because I need to emphasize that my presentation is solely a reflection of my personal views and not necessarily reflective of the views of my community association. The truth is, we have not had a chance to get together and talk about this.

1530

My purpose today is to share with you a glimpse of my vision of Canada, imperfect as it may be, by first making this oral presentation summarizing my views, and second presenting at a later date a more comprehensive written submission. Some of the organizations that I am involved with will also make a written submission at a later date.

I will begin my presentation by reading the opening stanza from a poem written by Robert Service, a poem called *The Ordinary Man*.

If you and I should chance to meet,
I guess you wouldn't care;
I'm sure you'd pass me in the street,
As if I wasn't there.
You'd never look me in the face,
My modest mug to scan,
Because I am just a commonplace,
An Ordinary Man.

It is my view that you will not find many an ordinary man making a presentation to this committee. Perhaps they will not because of indifference, insecurity or simply fear. These are very intimidating surroundings for most people: a dozen MPs, members of Parliament, television cameras, news media and so many strange faces. But I believe for the most part the ordinary man will not appear because of humility. He does not believe that his opinion is worthy of sharing simply because he believes he is ordinary and thus unimportant in the grand scheme of things.

Therefore, Mr Chairman, this committee must take steps to overcome this barrier. This committee needs to loosen its collective tie, step away from the security of the

podium and go, perhaps two by two, to meet the ordinary man. Go visit the local pub in Kenora and chat with its patrons. Go to the bowling alley, the community centre, recreation centre, the shopping mall, the seniors' centre, the aquatics club, the cultural centres, the homes on the reserve and schools. Stop and chat with the common man at the street level. Do this wherever you go in as many communities as you can. Go two by two to visit all of them if you can, and ask them what they think. They will not write; many cannot. They will not stop by; no time. Many cannot even speak your language.

The second stanza by Robert Service reads:

But then, it may be, you are too
A guy of every day,
Who does the job he is told to do
And takes the wife his pay;
Who makes a home and kids his care,
And works with pick or pen...
Why, Pal, I guess we're just a pair
Of Ordinary Men.

My only real concern about this Ontario consultative process is that you will not take the time to do this. You have a deadline and in my view this one is much, much too compressed. My first plea to you today is, please take the time for the ordinary citizen. Canada is too important, and he needs to speak, he needs to be heard before you exercise the burden of leadership. His fate is in your hands. Take the time and do it right or do not do it at all.

Conflicting loyalties: I now want to share with you my feelings, my anguish as a Franco-Ontarian or French-Canadian while I struggle with Quebec nationalism. A few generations ago my ancestors migrated from Quebec to Ontario. I represent the culmination of this migration, my total assimilation into Anglo culture. It is very sad but true: I am now part of the melting pot called "the real Canadian." But in spite of this assimilation, when I see the Quebec flag, the fleur de lys, when I see thousands and thousands of Québécois celebrating Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day and when I hear the cries, "Vive le Québec libre," my pulse races. From the very depth of my being, I respond to this cry for nationhood.

Several years ago I realized that if I had been Québécois I would most certainly be a staunch separatist. But I am not a Québécois. My birthright is in Ontario. I see myself as a Canadian—French, yes, but nevertheless a citizen of Canada—and my pulse races and pride wells up from deep within me because this country is the greatest in all the world. I shudder when I think of its demise. To this very day, I still struggle with these conflicting emotions, but I have learned to deal realistically with this conflict.

Several years ago I also realized that if I were to move and live in Quebec, I would feel étranger, a stranger. I would feel that I would not belong. I would become homesick for my birthplace of Ontario. I realized then that my loyalty, after is all is said and done, belongs to Canada, a united Canada. I concluded that if Quebec leaves Confederation, this will rock my foundation.

I feel that this act will disfranchise me and this is my plea to the Quebec ordinary man: "If you leave you will

take my heart with you, but my soul will remain in Canada. If you leave Canada, you crush my identity. You annihilate my loyalties. I cannot, I will not, envision a Canada without Quebec. I will become in heart, in mind and in soul a man without a country, a stateless man, loyal to none."

This is my plea to this committee. For me, Canada itself is not negotiable. You must keep our borders inviolable. I present to you my heart and my soul and my loyalty. Take them as a sacred trust and tell all, tell Quebec that the union itself is not negotiable. I deeply believe that to the ordinary Canadian, whether living in the east or the west, in Ontario or Quebec or in Canada's vast hinterland, Canada itself is not really negotiable.

Having said that Canada is not negotiable, I nevertheless feel that everything else is, everything else. This is why we are here today. The articles of Confederation, this master agreement, and everything contained therein is negotiable. Nothing within is inviolable. I agree that it is time now to renegotiate this agreement in the context of present-day reality, but this time it must be a comprehensive agreement that will consider the aspirations of all Canadians equally, not favouring one region or one sector or one group over another.

1540

The original Fathers of Confederation were successful. I ask myself, what about our present leaders? Are they less able? I think not, because where there is a will, there is a way, and afterwards there should be no need for anyone to leave this union.

The Quebec and aboriginal reality: Mr Chairman, in your deliberation I ask you to consider this viewpoint. Whatever term you use, whether it be sovereignty or sovereignty-association, whether it be self-government, self-determination or nationhood or masters at home controlling our own destiny, they all have a familiar ring. They all express, in my view, a universal desire, a cultural imperative, of a race of people wanting to control their own destiny without the shackles of oppression by a majority of others.

In my view the aspirations of Quebec and the aspirations of the aboriginal people or first nations of this country are the same and they must be given equal consideration within the context of this new agreement. It is hypocrisy to think otherwise. We must not enshrine a double standard again.

From a global perspective, their desires are not dissimilar to those expressed by blacks in South Africa or the people in the Baltic states or the Palestinian people or the Israeli people or the Kurdish people or dozens of other distinct peoples in the past 200 years of civilization. Our new agreement must recognize the fundamental aspirations of these distinct races, distinct peoples, and by doing so we can be an example to the world and fulfil our destiny of becoming a great nation—a universal right, a fundamental obligation.

Mr Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, we are all members of the human family but we are racially different and we must learn to live with these differences. By definition, a race is a family, a tribe, a people

or nation belonging to the same stock. It is a class or kind of people unified by community, community of interests and habits or characteristics. In my view, the Quebec people are distinct. Similarly, the aboriginal people in first nations in North America are a race and are distinct.

In my view, there exists a universal principle in relation to all races; whether in Canada or throughout the regions of the world, all races possess an inalienable right to self-determination and self-government, to choose their own destiny, to control their own lives without any sort of oppression. This right to self-determination and self-government is a fundamental human right which must not be extinguished, revoked or surrendered. It cannot be, because this right does not belong to any individual of that race but to all the people within that race; a basic right that belongs to their posterity, ancestral rights if you like, which belong to children and their children for generations to come. Any insistence that this right be extinguished, revoked or surrendered, in my view, is oppression.

If Quebec chooses to exercise this basic right and secede from Canada to become an autonomous state, then we are obligated to accede to their desires. If aboriginal or first nations choose to secede similarly, we must also respect their right to do so.

Now, this position appears to contradict my previous assertion that Canada itself is not negotiable. Let me try to explain and put it this way: Attached to this universal right within the context of a community of nations is a fundamental obligation to get along peacefully with your neighbour. Quebec and aboriginal first nations people have the basic right to choose their own destiny, but I do not have to be happy about it, particularly if by exercising their right it causes an adverse effect on mine.

We must not fight a bloody civil war to maintain the integrity of Canada, but it does involve sacrifice and we must make an enormous struggle and make very many sacrifices to maintain this union.

In response to Quebec's request for separation, or for any other province or people within the Dominion of Canada, I propose that we refuse outright and unconditionally to discuss or negotiate deconfederation. For example, if Quebec in a referendum votes to separate, to become sovereign, it will take a co-operative effort to dismantle Canada and I propose that we simply and absolutely refuse to enter into any such negotiations. No compromise: Canada itself is not negotiable.

Such obstinacy on our part will have terrible economic consequences to Canada and to Quebec, but that is a price that I am willing to pay to keep Canada intact, and so it is with the aboriginal first nations. You have the right to autonomy, but if you leave this union you do so without my blessing.

My response to the people of Quebec is that really the only viable alternative is to renegotiate the terms of the union, but not to abandon the union itself. In the final analysis, once the dust settles, you will still be a Canadian.

The multicultural reality: Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Canadian Confederation in 1867 was very different from the Canada of today. What was a predominantly bilingual and bicultural nation then has now evolved into a

multicultural and multilingual nation. We are now a nation of immigrants and when I envision the next 100 years—I ask that you do the same—I am convinced that this distinction will become even more pronounced.

I believe that our present vision of Canada as a bilingual and bicultural country is really a myth. To perpetuate this myth is to remain shackled to the past. I believe that we must now take a leap of faith, a leap into the future as a multicultural and multilingual nation. I believe that we must now divest ourselves of the narrowness imposed by an official bilingual policy and replace it with an official multilingual policy, where numbers warrant it and where minority rights are respected and protected equally. I believe the best way to accomplish this task and to ensure the protection of all languages and cultures in Canada is to include in the new agreement a provision for the recognition and protection of heritage languages and culture.

My vision of Canada is not a melting pot, but a vision of a truly global village, a community of nations, a miniature United Nations, if you like, united under the concept of a single Canadian nation.

Concluding remarks: My time has passed. I will submit a written response dealing with such varied aspects as decentralization, Senate reform, Ontario's role in Confederation, equalization payments, Charter of Rights and Freedoms, immigration, free trade, the Organization of American States and the United Nations, all of which I have some strong opinions on.

1550

I have one final point to make. The final draft of the new articles of Confederation must be put to a vote directly to the people. This can be done through a national referendum or a provincial referendum, but a referendum must be held. I want a direct say in this consultative process, which I am getting now, but also I want a direct choice on this matter to express a nay or yea. The events of this past decade have left me disillusioned. I have little faith and trust in politicians at this time.

Another of Robert Service's poems is called *The Law of the Yukon*. The first stanza reads:

This is the law of the Yukon, and ever she makes
it plain:
Send not your foolish and feeble; send me your
strong and your sane.

We the people have broken this law by sending too many of our foolish and feeble to Ottawa. Otherwise our country would not be in such a mess.

My final quotation from Robert Service is the last stanza of his poem *The Ordinary Man*:

We plug away and make no fuss,
Our feats are never crowned;
And yet it's common coves like us,
Who make the world go round.
And as we steer a steady course
By God's predestined plan,
Hats off to that almighty force:
The Ordinary Man.

Ladies and gentlemen, I want a referendum on the new agreement, on a new Constitution, on the articles of Confederation, whatever they might be. Good luck and thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Imbeau. As you notice, you have gone over the time. I did not want to interrupt you during your presentation. I am going to move on to the next presenter at this point, but I do want to say to you on behalf of the committee that we are quite conscious of the first area that you touched on in terms of process.

I think, as I said at the outset of the meeting today, that we see this first stage of our process as very clearly a first stage, and we do not suppose nor are we under any impression that we are going to be able to get the breadth of the views that exist across the province, nor could we ever, but I think that we feel we can get at least an initial sense of the different points of view that exist across the province.

We will be trying in various locations to do some of the very things you have suggested; that is, rather than sitting here around the table, to get out and talk with people in their own environments. We will do various things in different communities and then we will look for ways in which we can continue the discussions in the second stage of our work between the months of April to June. We appreciate your comments.

WALTER KOSTANTIN

The Chair: I call now Walter Kostantin.

Mr Kostantin: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Walter Kostantin from Jaffray and Melick, the large town to the north of Kenora. I want to thank you for including Kenora on your schedule. We appreciate providing input into your important task.

My comments are based purely on an economic basis and I mean no offence to anyone. My comments are my own. I am not affiliated with any group. My comments will be general rather than specific. I did not have the time or facilities to get the exact facts. I was only able to get a copy of your paper after I got to this meeting this afternoon.

Ontario's debt is increasing and it has lost its triple A status in the New York lending markets. I think it may have just recaptured that, but as I say, my facts may not be exactly on, but it is the best I know right now.

The Chair: I do not think that is true.

Mr Kostantin: Not true now?

The Chair: No.

Mr Kostantin: Thank goodness. Interest rates are pretty high. It is imperative that Ontario reduce its debt and so must Canada. Interest costs, as I said, are much too high.

The provincial government has been reducing its funding to municipalities for the past couple of years and asking the municipalities to assume the financial burden, in many cases, of areas they have imposed on the municipalities and not necessarily what the municipalities desired. These areas are health and welfare, social services, transportation, etc.

To come to my reason for being here, one of these areas is bilingualism and its attendant costs. The official policy has been to allow French and English on an equal

footing in localities which have at least a 10% francophone population.

Bilingualism has been initiated and fostered by the federal government in an attempt, I feel, to maintain friendly relations with Quebec, which for years has acted as the barometer in federal elections. It is my feeling that Quebec has received favoured status in Canada in return for its vote, no matter which political party is involved. I understand exactly what these statements say. It is not easy for a politician to want to perhaps admit openly to it, but I feel honesty should prevail and that the good of the country is paramount.

Recently, Quebec has suppressed the English language with Quebec Bill 178. Now they seem to want even greater powers which endanger the federal-provincial role for all of Canada. My recommendation is that Ontario revert to its English-language basis—I believe that at Confederation in the British North America Act there was nothing that guaranteed the French language in Upper Canada; correct me if I am wrong—and withdraw from official bilingualism. The economic benefits would become immediately apparent. It is reported that the United States of America is spending about \$1 billion per day in the Gulf war. This is an appalling amount of money. But so does official bilingualism in Canada with its reported similar amounts of money being spent on bilingualism.

I ask you to consider reverting to an official English policy and put the funding back to the municipalities for the greater good of the many, rather than the few. In another way, direct our financial reserves to the benefit of the greatest need in order to keep municipal taxes at an acceptable level to all. Please forgive me if some of my comments are not 100% correct, but they do express my personal view to the best of my knowledge. I am not against culture appreciation. I feel culture will flourish, if need be, without its being legislated. Thank you for your attention.

Mr Bisson: I think, like most Ontarians and most Canadians, we share one thing in common and it is that we are interested in making sure that our provinces and our country is in a fiscal position where they can afford to do the things that they need to do. One of the things you are quoting is that the cost of official bilingualism in Canada and Ontario is too high to maintain those services outside of Quebec. Realizing part of your argument sort of eludes me, because Quebec for years has offered services to minority-language anglophones in Quebec, such as post-secondary education, service in hospitals, government services, access to the court systems and yet it is not an issue there, can you explain the duality?

1600

Mr Kostantin: I really cannot explain it, I am not in a position to really know. But whatever Quebec has done in the past, I am sure, has been for its own interests. I hardly think that is consistent with Bill 178, where they are suppressing the English language.

Mr Bisson: I am just more interested in the monetary aspect of what you are saying, because if Ontario were to have the rights the minority-language anglophones have in

Quebec, I think I would be happy as a francophone here in Ontario. I guess what I am saying is that those services you talk about cost a heck of a lot of money and have been in place in Quebec for years and it has never been an issue of money there. It has been an issue of making sure as Canadians that we have access, no matter where we are in this country, to services that are provided by our government. I am just coming back to the point of saying, where does the money come into this? Because when we are talking about services, it has been done in Quebec for years. I fail to see your argument.

Mr Kostantin: I am not aware of what Quebec has done in the past. I do feel that with Confederation there was no guarantee for the French language in Ontario. That is something that has been given to us recently by Pierre Trudeau. As far as fostering the French language and culture as part of a founding nation is concerned, I think he did well. But as the previous speaker mentioned, this is no longer a Confederation; it is no longer Pierre Trudeau.

I think in Toronto your Italian population is perhaps the number one population and so things have changed. Multiculturalism I believe is in, yes, and I think all ethnic groups should have an equal voice in what they would like to see in Ontario. I think we owe it to them. They would not have come here if they did not think they were going to get something like that.

Mr Beer: One of the things that seems to be very important in our discussions as we go around the province, as it has been pointed out earlier, is the question of values and vision. That leads obviously into the kind of vision that we have of our country. The second part of that, I think, is being brutally honest with ourselves that there is now in the province of Quebec a movement—however you want to define it—which may be too far down the road towards separation or towards the kind of Canada that perhaps a lot of us in this room might be uncomfortable with.

I guess that leads me back then to the sense that I think we have to have the perspective of history and the understanding that French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians have had that somehow in something that is called Canada there will be some kind of respect for those two languages. In that context, how do we put a price on that when we know that if Ontario were to leave Canada, the consequences of that—well, neither you nor I nor anyone on this committee today can say they are such and such. We know that the economic consequences, if no others, would be very great, just as we know that in any divorce no matter how amicable, no matter how well the two parties want to try to settle that, there are bound to be consequences and there are bound to be pain and difficulties.

As I listen to you, I think we have to discuss this question of languages; it is imperative and we must not have people feeling that somehow they cannot raise it, cannot talk about it. It is my feeling that if we talk about it, then when I look at Ontario and I look at what we do within this province to try to provide certain basic educational services, social services, health services and the like to our francophone minority, it seems to me that those are

a relatively small price to pay in the same context as my colleague has noted, that within Quebec they too pay a price, if you will, in order to have a variety of English-language institutions and services.

Is there not somewhere within that, as a country, looking at our past, looking at what we have accomplished together, to see a role for the protection of those two languages which would include having certain linguistic rights in this province and in the province of Quebec?

My sense is that if we in Ontario were to say, "In so far as the provincial government has anything to do with it, there will be no French-language services," the impact of that on Quebec and indeed on Canada would be a body blow to any hope of trying to keep this country together. If we put the question in a slightly different way in terms of the cost, maybe the tradeoff would be different, maybe it would not.

Mr Kostantin: I know what you are saying. Whenever it is necessary, I believe there should be the opportunity to have French services. I have been along the Trans-Canada Highway to the east for many many years. I have noticed the French communities along the way. I have worked in Quebec. I have taken all of high school French. I have taken university French. I have travelled to France and found myself not being understood. That is another issue. That is my own problem. So I am not against the French language per se, but I feel that the rest of Ontario, or even in a broader context the rest of Canada, should not have to pay for that. They are founding nations, and then you will get the native population coming along and saying, "Hey, are they really founding nations?" That gets a little complicated and I would rather not get into that.

I feel if you want to be fair with founding nations and any nation, any culture, then take it to a referendum of the municipalities or the regions. Those regions that really strongly believe they should have that facility and say so should then pay for it, because they are going to be direct recipients of it. The other parts of the province and country that do not receive or get that same feeling from the services should not have to pay. I know that is also saying we should not have equalization of payments in health, welfare, social services, etc. in Ontario for all of Ontario, not just for certain parts of it, but be that as it may. With a referendum, if the local population really wants to have French services, then it should have it, but then it should be also paying for it and there should be some mechanism where the provincial government might be able to pick up some of that tab in some circumstances.

I am not saying we should do away with it where it is necessary, I am saying be very careful. We should not be having a tremendous amount of money expenditure for, say, the fewer rather than the masses. Our taxes could probably be much better divided if we had a little more of that money.

You know, Émile is a friend of mine. When he spoke here, the exodus to the back to get the translation device was tremendous. In fact, I did not even get one, so I had to try and go on my memory, which was not as good as it should be.

That is what it is like here in the Kenora area. Most of the people are English-speaking. The French-speaking people here are acceptable. We are communicating with each other. I do not think they are all leading a bandwagon saying they want more. They have learned to live with each other; they have learned to live with the services. But if you get the federal government imposing a French language requirement in certain federal positions, then you will have a parent saying, "If my child is going to have an equal opportunity in this great, vast country, I'm going to have him get French, because otherwise he won't work for the civil service in the federal government." So it is being imposed.

Mr Harnick: We as a committee have to weigh the things we hear from the various people who are going to present their opinions to us. One of the things I have great difficulty with is that your whole presentation was based upon certain costs that you allude come from the French language. You allude to the fact that our country has a great big debt, both federally and provincially, and you allude to the cause of that debt being the French language and the use of the French language and bilingualism. That is what I heard you say. I would like to hear from you what facts, what figures you can supply this committee with so that we can know what foundation your opinions are based upon, because unless we know those facts and figures, I cannot walk away from here saying your opinion is really worth anything, quite frankly.

Mr Kostantin: Without basis and facts, I should not question you at all. In fact, I believe in facts myself.

Mr Harnick: I appreciate that you believe the facts, but supply us with the facts so we have something to sit down and consider as opposed to an opinion picked out of the air.

1610

Mr Kostantin: I will try to get those facts to you. As I say, I just started writing a few thoughts down this morning on this sheet of paper. I did not have the papers yet. I was not quite sure. I had phoned these numbers to get this information last week. I have tried.

Mr Harnick: I am not missing anything, though.

Mr Kostantin: I think you are if you say all the costs are attributable to French-language services.

Mr Harnick: No, what I referred to, though, is that I did not miss any of your presentation where those facts were contained.

Mr Kostantin: No.

Mr Harnick: You are acknowledging now that those facts are not available at this time.

Mr Kostantin: The \$1 million-plus on bilingualism in Canada I read on a paper a year or so ago back. I could get that paper for you if you like. I do not vouch for the paper. That is something I read and I will take it as fact, otherwise it should not be published.

Mr Harnick: Other than that fact you do not have any others, though.

Mr Kostantin: No. But I can get you that.

Mr Harnick: All right. I appreciate that.

ANDREW CHAPESKIE

The Chair: I call Andrew Chapeskie. For the information of the members of the committee, after Mr Chapeskie, there is at least one other person that I have been told will be speaking to us.

Mr Chapeskie: I have come not so much to make a presentation but more to express a certain amount of anxiety which many northerners feel. Some find it hard to express. It is rather inchoate.

Some pin the problems in certain places. We are spending \$1 million a day on bilingualism. We are spending \$2 million a day on the war in the Gulf. What I want to ask this committee and what I want in particular to ask of the social democratic government in Ontario is how we who live in the north are going to fit into a new constitutional context in Canada and whether any changed constitutional context will make any difference for us at all. I think the problems we face are very deep and very structural. I work as a legal anthropologist, as a lawyer and also as a community field worker with aboriginal people in economic activities in this part of the country.

I believe that the gulf between where we are now and where we have to go is so great for the north as to render this type of exercise perhaps largely meaningless.

Here are our issues; the *Globe and Mail*, Tuesday 11 December 1990, page 1, a clear-cut of timber, a forest clear-cut in northern Ontario adding up to a contiguous area in square kilometres, 2,693 square kilometres of clear-cut timber. The previous speaker said he went from Hearst to Kapuskasing to Cochrane. The region, this area, this one area stretches from Hearst to Kapuskasing, maybe almost to Cochrane. We have a tremendous problem that we are going to have to deal with and I believe that an old Anishnawbe Ojibway elder, who talked to his son and his son talked to me, hit the basis of the problem. He said to his son, "The problem that the white society faces is that their way is 'anacronawaygin.' Their way is based on power, control and domination, not being content to understand what is in the circle, but to control what is outside of the circle." Those of us in northwestern Ontario who live here act out as dependent people. We are very dependent on a system which may be beyond government capacity to cope with.

Dr Noel Brown, the head of the United Nations environment program in New York, said we may be approaching the end of that period in which governments were the centrepiece of social organization and direction. People are saying we do not have money to live the way we have lived in the past. The federal government, according to Dian Cohen in the *Toronto Star* and on *Venture*, is bankrupt. But I do not believe we are working any less hard than we ever have.

Brown and other activists have said that the new opportunities for those people in peripheral areas may be best seized upon through alternative strategies rather than by going through government. I think this may apply to whether they are peace issues, environmental issues, economic issues or whatever. I want to ask this social demo-

cratic government that it think long, hard and seriously about the structural dynamics to the problems that we are facing.

The problem of funding bilingualism in Cochrane may be small if we look at where we are going economically, and we in the north feel this especially. I think if there is to be constitutional development in Canada that is going to meet the dynamics of the new emerging paradigm, we have to really tune in to the strengths that can be built upon. There is a massive amount of activity, scholarship that is leading us to certain principles which were first articulated by the original founders of social democracy in Canada. That is economic democracy.

Our social democratic government in Ontario, I do not even know that it has a position on worker ownership, on local ownership, on co-operative economics. The Minister of Cooperative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Manitoba in the Progressive Conservative government has a better articulated program for worker participation in the economy.

I think aboriginal peoples have a tremendous amount to teach us, but we are not getting out and reaching the grass roots. We have a Minister of Northern Development who flies into Kenora and snips ribbons on a highway and then flies out on a private government jet. I thought that ended with the previous government. If there is to be constitutional change, that change can account for pluralism, it can account for diversity, but it must build on a social democratic paradigm which we must capture and bring to life in this region.

My only suggestion as a person, as an individual speaking to you on behalf of myself, is that in this country, if we are going to have constitutional updating, in addition to all of the other stuff like cultural pluralism, I would urge that this government look at environmental issues and consider within the constitutional framework an environmental bill of rights. Do not get left behind.

I would also urge that this government consider the constitutional status of aboriginal peoples in Ontario and specifically that you look carefully at how aboriginal people are different than we are and how that can be accommodated within the constitutional context and the context of self-government, because I believe that it can be to the tremendous benefit of this country.

1620

I also urge within this that the social democratic government we have in Ontario return to the roots of social democracy in Canada, look at what economic democracy means, look at what participation means and see how that is so critically related to other issues which must be resolved at a constitutional level but which may never be without this new order being established in this province.

We have unique opportunities and I think it is now up to our government to begin with some experiments. They do not have to be big, but they have to be bold. They have to reach out to the grass roots and they have to make sure that we in the north, and especially aboriginal people in the north, do not continue to feel so alienated from this country.

Mr Malkowski: I was truly impressed by your presentation. It is a lot for me to look at and think about regarding this committee. You talk about the serious problem that relates to the structure in our governmental system as it is now. So are you suggesting that we restructure our governmental system so that we can empower our people, for instance our natives and other special groups in the northern area?

I guess what you are saying is, the Constitution does not reflect the needs of the northerners. Could you expand and perhaps give me a few examples on how we can restructure and empower the citizens, or maybe any models that you see in other provinces, something for us to concentrate on so that we can promote a social democratic structure?

Mr Chapeskie: What I am saying is that many of the constitutional issues may make no difference to us in the north and they may make no difference to many peoples in what I call hinterland regions of this country, the regions from which the resources of this country are being taken to keep us going.

What can we do in the Constitution that can allow us to recover our sense of economic self-determination rather than living dependent and co-dependent lives in the north? I think this government can promote ideas, principles and practices of economic democracy which can help in that way and which in turn will alleviate problems or anxieties which are ventilated through constitutional frameworks where they may not be structurally related to them.

If we have problems where we have people in dependent situations and we can accept that their culture is vastly different from ours, and even those of us who are northerners have cultural priorities different from those who are in the south, can we then develop contexts of economics to encourage people to liberate themselves out of a lot of anxiety and dependent ways of thinking and assume more responsibility?

Much of that can be done at the local level. Much of it does not require constitutional change. But much of the anxiety that exists right now is finding its frustration at constitutional talks or in a constitutional forum or in any other forum. I think this government has a unique opportunity to build some bridges that way.

Mr Malkowski: You talk about Manitoba having a unique system regarding the economic system by the government there. Could you elaborate a little bit more on that? Why do you feel that ours is not as good as or up to par compared to the others?

Mr Chapeskie: I only say that the Minister of Cooperative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Manitoba has defined his position on workplace democracy and specifically on worker ownership better than has the social democratic government in Ontario. Why is that, if workplace democracy and participation, as we now know through studies at the University of Pennsylvania and the London School of Economics, unleashes productive potential?

The Chair: Thanks for the presentation. Once again, I apologize because we were not able to get through all the questions that I know are there.

JOHN KARWACKI

Mr Karwacki: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is John Karwacki and I am a councillor with the town of Kenora. I would like to apologize that, had I known I would be heard, I would have dressed for the occasion.

The Chair: Quite all right, sir.

Mr Karwacki: Of course, we have been all over the living room on everything but Confederation, and I have a few reminders for our distinguished listeners on the issue of Quebec, which is basically what we have talked about. It is my opinion and I would like it on the record that I speak as an individual not as a councillor. Anything I say as a councillor does not wash.

I think that the politicians, the federal politicians in particular and you people who are the politicians in one of the strongest provinces in Canada, should tell Quebec categorically—it has never been done—that there will be no separation. I have never heard in all my years of anybody separating in any country under similar circumstances without a shot fired. Now I do believe that we may go on for another 100 or 200 years arguing about it and correcting all the things that are wrong with whatever is wrong, but like everything else there is never anything perfect, not in this life. If we can send an army halfway around the world on a mission that is none of our business, I am sure that the same army could remind the politicians in Quebec that we intend to stay together.

Having said that, I would like to remind you that there are other things about Confederation, Confederation with the other provinces. I do not want to blame you but you are guilty by association, in that the thing that is going to hold this country together—and you have seen it fall apart, it is coming unglued; You have allowed the post office to become a miserable service, an embarrassment. You have allowed the CPR to turn around and take half the country. It should be running the railroad. It puts us on an exercise, "Oh yes, let's blame Via Rail." That is not where the problem is. We are not in the railroad business. The CPR is in the railroad business. Without a railroad in this country, you have got a pathetic system of travel. The army cannot even move. Our army will not be able to move across this country.

Our airlines are pathetic. If I want to go to Kirkland Lake or to Wawa, right behind you at about the centre of the province, I cannot get there. It takes me two days to get to Wawa because I do not drive 12 hours straight. I do not think anybody should. Here you have a province that is so big—I may suggest this flippantly, but move the capital of Ontario to the geographical centre of Ontario. You do not need it in Toronto.

1630

Then the gas prices. When you leave here, go home and look at your gas prices at the pumps and then take a look at ours on your way out. This is a sore spot, and do not ever think that the tourists do not know what is going on here. They are being gouged; we are being gouged. There is no reason for it. Our oil crosses the border, goes into North Dakota and it is sold there for less than half the price we pay for it. That is Confederation for you. It is

things like that that are going to separate all of us, never mind just Quebec.

You have a situation where you are talking free trade. We are progressively getting free trade, and yet you do not have free trade between the provinces. You have got marketing boards and other boards and regulations with wheat and liquor and beer, a mishmash. Little aggravations, they say. What in fact are we as a province? What in fact are we as Canadians?

The roads are rabbit trails, absolutely unacceptable. You would think that life began and ended in front of the Royal York. Try travelling across this province. It is unbelievable. Try travelling across it in a one-ton truck with stiff springs. I assure you that there is nobody here in this room that will look as cool and elegant after a ride like that. Listen to us. Those roads there are for Canadians, they are not just for Ontarians. If you want Canada to stick together, give it a railroad, give it a road, give it something. Think about it.

Getting closer to home, there are things happening within the province that I am not very happy about. You have heard of it but you have done nothing about it. It is legislation: policing courthouses, extra costs. Turn your backs on the municipalities and say, "You will do this and you will do that." No amount of police in any courthouse will protect the judge if he is marked to be destroyed. There is just no way. You know it and it is ridiculous to assume otherwise.

The Young Offenders Act: You could have a murderer right next door to you and your grandchildren and you would not know it. Foolish legislation.

Education: We have got schools all over the province and the children go to grade 12, 13, they go to university. What do they do? They go to work in Toronto. We are like a great big school day nursery. If you are going to get the benefits from all the kids that have the brains and the knowledge, I think you had better pay for the education.

I also think that when I get put on social services—of all things, put me on a committee for social services and I say, "Well, I want the names and the amounts of money the people on welfare are getting because I am not going to spend the taxpayers' money without knowing where it is going." So they say, "Oh no, no, no, no, the province says you can't have that." We are now into freedom of information, the most ridiculous thing you ever saw. We are talking freedom of information and we are getting less of it.

If you want to turn around and have certain rules, like what I just mentioned on welfare where you pay 80% and we pay 20%, you had better be prepared to pay the whole 100% because our 20% is a lot harder to get than your 80%, especially when you mark up liquor at 1,000%.

An annoyance that has been across this province has been the cartel, Brewers' Retail. You have had the Kenora District Municipal Association, the Northern Ontario Municipal Association, Association of Municipalities of Ontario, the chamber of commerce come to you. We want a better method of retailing beer. So what did you do? You ignored them. You talk about Confederation? That will confederate you.

The government turns around and says all municipalities can decide if they want Sunday shopping. We go around here and we argue and we fight, we get threats, I have been to hell twice. Then you let Howard Hampton loose—you should tie a bell on him—and he keeps saying he is going to cut it out, you are going to do something about it, you are going to revert back to no Sunday shopping. If our paper mill goes down here—and they voted 97% to go on strike—we are dead in the water. All we have got is tourism. That extra day, that Sunday, may save our life.

Now, to close—I do not want to be all night, because as you can see, I am a man of few words—talk about ridiculous: I read in the paper that the government of Ontario raised the marriage licences from \$35 to \$50 because the people who were recording all these things were overworked and it was interfering with their coffee breaks.

I want to tell you something. How ridiculous can you get? We have got 8% of the population that is not married. Now, you know what happens when there is a marriage and you have got six kids with six different fathers and mothers, how hard it is to record that. You should have taken that \$35 and rubbed it out, wrote a cheque for anybody who got married and said: "Here, thanks for getting married. Here's \$50 for a good time." Thanks a lot.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. I do not know if there are any questions. I see none. Thank you very much for your views.

I think that concludes the list of presenters before us this afternoon. If we can recess until this evening at 6 o'clock, we will be back at 6 o'clock promptly. What I would like to suggest is, I know that there probably will be some people who will want to talk informally. I have been asked to clear the hall, because they need to set up for this evening. Perhaps we could move downstairs, and that would allow some informal discussion to continue.

Mr Offer: Will our materials here be secure?

The Chair: I believe you can leave all the materials here unless I am told otherwise.

Thank you very much. We will resume at 6 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 1637.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1822 at the Royal Canadian Legion, Kenora.

CJBN-TV

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. We are resuming our hearings from Kenora. We had, I think, an interesting afternoon in which we heard from a number of people, and we have a full evening of presenters, so without further ado we will proceed with our first deputant: from CJBN-TV, Norcom Telecommunications, Wally Wiebe.

Mr Wiebe: On behalf of CJBN, I would like to thank the committee for allowing us to speak. As I listened to the proceedings today, I was a bit leery about whether this little speech I have for you would be appropriate.

We are observers in the television media and when we were asked what we felt Ontario's role in Confederation was, this is what we came up with.

Ontario is the heart and soul of Confederation. As go Ontario's feelings and stands regarding this country's unity, so go the other provinces. Only by constant communication and understanding of all who live in this province can we continue to grow and unite as one. Confederation was initially established through the communications between the provinces, but to remain an intact society we must reach out to everyone and let not the concerns of others fall upon deaf ears.

Whatever language one speaks should not matter as long as communication continues. Whatever the racial background one may have should not stop him or her from speaking out his concerns and being heard. Everyone elected to represent this province and in fact all of Canada should listen and respond to the needs of all communities, no matter whether it is as large as Toronto or as small as Kenora.

Confederation in this province, as in the rest of Canada, does not start in Ottawa but with neighbours, friends and acquaintances. It starts with you and me and then grows to the municipal levels and then the provincial levels. Only by communicating with individuals can a group be heard. As I stated in the beginning, Ontario leads the way. Communication is the key to what Ontario's role is in Confederation.

As we at CJBN are in the communications field, we are striving to do our part. Presently we are in the midst of a proposal to broadcast the daily regional newscasts into the existing CBC Winnipeg signal that is delivered to our region in northwestern Ontario. This will give us the opportunity to provide local news and entertainment to the Red Lake, Fort Frances and Dryden areas and beyond. This is something that has not been done before and has been needed for a very long time, giving individuals in local communities the ability to communicate better. Ontario's ability to communicate, understand and respond to its people plays a major role in what Confederation is all about.

As I said, it is a short speech. We are here to observe.

The Chair: Thank you. Before opening for questions, I just want to say—I should have mentioned this earlier—

that I do appreciate it if people keep their presentation within the time lines, because we do want to allow also some time for questions from the members of the committee.

Mr Michlash: First, thank you very much for your brief—a very brief brief, as you mentioned—to the committee. The key, of course, of what you are saying and what we have talked about is good communication and the importance of that throughout the province. You mentioned a project that CJBN is presently working on, where it is trying to bring in more communication for local events and maybe more provincial communications into the area. Can you expand on that?

Mr Wiebe: We anticipate that we will be able to do a weekly news program. We will have Electronic News Gathering in Red Lake, Fort Frances and Dryden, and they will cover their district areas. People right now do not have it unless we in Kenora travel way up into those regions to gather news, and then of course it is long gone, it is past. We want to give people the news of what is happening in their area on that day, let them speak their minds on events that are happening throughout their communities.

Mr Michlash: Where are you in the process at present?

Mr Wiebe: Darryl Michaluk, our station manager, and Nick Chevreffis, who is in our marketing management, are in Toronto right now talking to the various councils who control whether we do get it.

Mr F. Wilson: Thank you for your presentation. As someone who is obviously in tune with your community and someone who has probably had the chance we have not had to observe this meeting—you said you saw the morning's events—perhaps you could maybe enlighten us about some of the presentations you saw and some of the local feelings in the community, what is important to Kenora and things like that.

Mr Wiebe: I think the main thing with Kenora is that people want to be heard. They do not want the doors closed on them. They want to be able to have their say, and if the doors are closed they are not going to be happy, so that is what we are striving for here. Being in reporting myself, I find that if you let people have a microphone they will say their piece; they are willing to and they are very open around here. They need to have that door open.

Mr F. Wilson: Is that the impression you are getting from this show we are putting on?

Mr Wiebe: Yes. This is probably the best thing possible for them, that they are able to speak their minds. It is very good that the committee came out here.

Mr Bisson: Just a short question. It may be a bit of repetition, but with regard to the events that will be taking place over the next couple of years and the new constitutional talks in this country, what role do you see the media playing when it comes to being able to bring out what is happening, what the story is? Some of us sometimes get the feeling that the agenda is being created from the other side, and I just want you to comment on that, if possible.

Mr Wiebe: You mean that the broadcasters make the news rather than—

Mr F. Wilson: In some cases. I am trying to be very diplomatic, obviously. They are all saying, "Go for the jugular," but no. What happens is that at times a particular part of the story will be reported whereas the bigger part sometimes needs to be explained to understand the whole puzzle. How do you see the media being able to do that job in a good way to make sure that people understand what the issues are?

Mr Wiebe: It is very strange in Kenora. We cover every issue that comes our way. Being a small community, we have to, because sometimes it is very lean that things happen around here, but we are very thorough and we get both sides. We anticipate that carrying on for a very long time, at least throughout our area and the areas we cover. As I said, we have to cover both sides.

Mr Malkowski: We certainly were very impressed with your presentation. When you talk about the role of the media in making sure that communication remains open regardless of language and culture, does your own station provide service in languages other than English? Is there a francophone service provided? Is there open captioning, for example, for deaf people? What other services do you provide in order to make communication happen?

Mr Wiebe: CJBN is one of the smallest or the smallest TV station in the whole of Canada. We are hoping, of course, that with this possible expansion we can change that. We are hoping to give the native people an opportunity to have a half-hour program each week, as I understand from Mr Michaluk, our station manager, in order to expand on their own issues. As to captions for deaf people, etc, I do not know to what extent we will go.

1830

Mr Malkowski: When we talk about the role of the media and looking at how much freedom the media may take with certain issues, what is your personal perspective on that?

Mr Wiebe: As far as covering the entire story? I feel it would be morally right to cover a story fully, giving both sides. I do not think it is right to choose sides. It is not up to me to do so.

MARLENE BROWN

The Chair: The next presenter is Marlene Brown. I believe members should receive a copy of the brief.

Ms Brown: My name is Marlene Brown, and I have concerns and I have views.

Canada and the world: Since Confederation, Canada has welcomed settlers from the whole world community. The result has been an exciting mosaic of a country, with a rich heritage gleaned from all nations as well as developed from the nature of the country. For this reason, if for no other, Canada must present herself as a peacekeeper to the world. When we declare war on another nation, we are asking some Canadians to take up arms against their brothers.

For the most part, we have learned to live together in this great land, and even with growing pains such as Oka,

we have found dialogue to be the best means to solve disputes.

Canada and Quebec: Quebec should not be given a more special status than any of the other provinces enjoys within Confederation and should certainly not expect special treatment if it opts out of the country. It would be a definite loss to Canada if Quebec decides to go on its own, but Quebec's loss will be even greater. Canada only loses one; Quebec loses 11. No one province should hold the rest of the country at ransom.

The Ontario scene, labour: Labour law in Ontario should protect the majority in labour disputes with tough antiscab legislation. Businesses should never be allowed to disrupt communities to the extent we have seen across the border in places like International Falls, Minnesota, and Rumford, Maine.

There can never be pay equity without taking the next step, job equity. There were too many exemptions from the pay equity program and as a result even wider gaps have been created.

Equal opportunity programs have opened up a whole new can of worms. Now individuals are being hired because they are women or because they are members of a minority, not because they are best for the jobs. I guess the only remedy for this situation is for the employer not to know the sex, nationality, religion, age or physical condition of the applicant until after the position is filled.

Areas should be protected from the importation of uncompetitive labour. As a town situated on the border of a province with a lower minimum wage, many contracts are awarded out of province and our local labour force suffers because of this.

Municipalities: Municipalities should not be encouraged by the province to expand their boundaries unless the request has been put forward from the area concerned, and then only if the cost of services versus tax dollars gained makes the proposition viable.

Environment: Environmental ministries should be made conscious of their mandate and treat all violators equally, including other ministries. They should not expect the public to do their job for them. This may be a localized problem, but somehow I feel this is not the case.

Chemical warfare on nature is devastating our environment. The use of salt as a de-icing agent is poisoning our soil and our waterways. Defoliants used to maintain right of way and in forest management are not explored or tested for long-term effects. The ministries go by the manufacturer's literature and I get very nervous about a statement that reads, "The results from extensive testing conducted by both [the manufacturer] and outside agencies indicate that at levels applied on forestry site, there poses virtually no danger to humans or animals." The key words are "at levels applied" and "virtually." The chemicals used on spruce budworm were found to contain ingredients used in Agent Orange, with cancer-causing results.

Short-term remedies have time and again proven themselves to have devastating long-term effects. PCBs, DDT and nuclear waste are excellent examples that show us no matter how smart we become, we are not as smart as we think we are.

I know there are many, many more issues, but on such short notice it is difficult to make a proper presentation. I feel like a surfer in a choppy sea: I am only hitting the tops of the waves and cannot settle in to enjoy the ride.

In closing, Ontario is the pace-setter of our nation, a senior partner in Confederation, and as such it must strive to keep up with and ahead of the concerns facing Ontario, Canada, North America and the world today and tomorrow. Top on that list should be our environment. We cannot survive in a fouled nest. Governments must be handed a mandate to preserve our planet, or where Mother Nature is concerned, "Hell hath no fury like a woman scorned." Submitted with respect.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Brown. I think there are a few questions, but let me just say to you first that as you have time to think a little more about some of these issues or other issues, if you want to write to us we would be happy to have your comments on anything additional you want to send us.

Mr Offer: First, let me thank you for your presentation. You have raised some of those issues which you feel are of crucial importance. I do not think there are many around who would disagree with you that environment and labour and municipal issues are ones which are important and which impact on all of us every day.

My question deals with the current state of negotiations which seem to be evolving, with Quebec asking for extended powers. I recognize that is not yet a formal position, but it is in the first stages of an evolving position. My question to you is not so much about what Quebec's position may or may not be in the final analysis, but rather an acknowledgement that there is probably going to be some change somewhere down the line. When and where, no one knows at this point in time. But what should Ontario's position be? What do you, as a person who has brought forward important issues of concern for so many people, see Ontario's role should be as Quebec negotiates in an evolving manner with the federal government? What role should this province have as that proceeds?

Ms Brown: Ontario is as large as, and should have as much say as but not any more say than, all the rest of the provinces together. In any kind of democratic society, I would say the majority is who should say. If the provinces are in full agreement, allow them to have special powers, but I think the mandate should come from the people in the provinces and it should be on a democratic basis.

I would hate to see Quebec out of the country, because Quebec is special. They have a special heritage, but, then again, so does Manitoba. Every one of the provinces is special unto itself. But they should not have special privileges that make them an entity aside from Canada. They should still be Canadians first. I am a Canadian first; I am an Ontarian second.

Mr Offer: I sense from your presentation as it deals with these issues that there is an underlying premise that it is crucially important that the country remain together. There may be an enlargement of powers to all the provinces. That may be, but what is of crucial importance is

that they remain together so that these issues can be dealt with in a concerted effort.

Ms Brown: We should be Canadians first.

Mr Bisson: You raised a point, I think, that was raised earlier this afternoon. We never had a chance to address it because of lack of time, and I would like to come back to it. In regard to trading between provinces, we find ourselves at a time when we have negotiated a free trade agreement with the United States that has certain limitations, I guess, if you want, on our side, but it is supposed to set up a mechanism of trade between north and south. What you are saying here is that we need to address what is happening east-west in regard to trading among the provinces. Can you share with the committee what you think needs to be done in future constitutional talks when it comes to addressing those questions? Just to give you an idea of where I am coming from, you alluded in your presentation to the price of labour between Manitoba and Ontario. Is it your view that Ontario should have to bring its rates down or Manitoba bring its up, as an example? How do you address all of these very complex questions?

Ms Brown: Okay, there I was putting in my view that the contractors who are awarded from this town should take into consideration the people who live in this area first, not outside, regardless of the fact that they may be able to underbid because their labour costs them less. They bring them in from Manitoba. They do not have to pay them as much as what our people here are getting, and our people are out of jobs.

Mr Bisson: I would like to go a little bit further. First of all, my belief is that we live in a democratic society, this Canada of ours. We have the right as individuals to work where we want, to come and go as we want, because that is the whole premise of a democracy. What I picked up in what you were saying in your presentation is that we need, as government at the provincial level, with our federal government, to sit down and to try to work out some of the differences between the provinces so that indeed we are not in the situation you are describing.

Ms Brown: That is one possible solution. I would say. Yes, that was one possible solution. It would make them more competitive at that rate.

Mr Beer: As a former English teacher, it was an utter delight to read your presentation. Penmanship is alive and well in Kenora. Thank you.

Ms Churley: I would just like to make one comment. I am very pleased to see that you raised the environment as one of your major concerns. It is something that is a major concern of mine. I do not think it has been raised a lot in terms of the Constitution before. I think we are going to be hearing more and more about it. I think it is very relevant to what we are trying to do as a country together as our environment deteriorates more and more. That is something we all know as Canadians we are going to have to work together on, because our environment, from one province to another, the air and the water, we all affect each other that way. So I would was really happy to see somebody really focusing on something that is dear to my heart, and I would like to thank you for that. I am sure it

will be coming up again. This time around I think we are going to see that environmental concerns are part of the whole constitutional debate.

Ms Brown: We have run into that scenario between the provinces right in this area, because the water supply in Winnipeg comes out of Shoal Lake, which is mostly in Ontario. They felt that there was a pollution problem going on there, so it is an interprovincial thing. We cannot isolate ourselves on it. It has got to be not just the communities and the province and the country; it has got to be the whole world.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Brown.

BILL LAFFIN

The Chair: We call now Bill Laffin.

Mr Laffin: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, I have many things I would like to speak about, but due to the limited time I will start with the one I think is most important and go on to the others if I have time. The first item that I feel is of prime importance to me is national unity.

A number of years ago we instituted two of the most divisive machineries we could possibly invoke to create division within our country. One is the two official languages. When you impose one official language upon a multilingual country, you detract from every person in the country who does not have that language as a mother language. When you impose two official languages upon a multilingual nation, all you can expect is diversity and animosity and problems, because you are pitting one language against the other.

There is only one nation in Canada, not two nations. The "two nations" concept is wrong. So we should not have any official language in Canada; there should be no official language. Let the people use the language that fits them in the area and the region in which they belong. There is only one nation: Canada. People like myself, who went through the Second World War, will certainly understand what I am talking about, although the younger people may not.

Third is the problem that we have had for some time with the province of Quebec. As you know, we repatriated our Constitution, and in that process it was very necessary for each of the provinces to re-sign the Constitution, to recommit itself to the nation called Canada. Nine provinces signed it; one refused. That one province was Quebec. They wanted special concessions for their special society, and they did have special considerations to consider, but the other provinces said no. So Quebec said, "No, we will not sign." Special legislation had to be initiated in order to keep the province within Canada while the negotiations went on.

In the 10 years that followed that, Quebec has consistently refused to sign the Constitution. "Mr Mellowroney," if you pardon the play on words, with his boardroom voice and his boardroom air, instituted the Meech Lake accord, which is merely a system by which, instead of Quebec refusing to join Canada, it made it appear that Canada was refusing to accept Quebec. That is a wrong impression. Right today, if Quebec would come to the table and sign

the Constitution of Canada, the same as every other province signed it, it will be welcomed with open arms.

We have a wonderful family in Canada. We have 10 provinces and two territories; 10 children born, 2 in the oven, so to speak. That family has to live harmoniously in the one building. When you get one of the oldest youngsters, who says, "I want my own TV or I'm going to leave home," the crowd gets together and says: "By God, you can't break up the family. Let's give him the TV." Then it is a motorcycle, then it is a car. Finally he says: "I want my own room in this house, with my own rules. I don't have to go by any of your rules, and if you don't agree, I'm going to leave and I'm going to take that strip of land across the front of your house so that you can't get to the highway."

1850

There comes a time when you have to say: "Enough is enough, kid. You're creating more disruption in this home than we can afford to handle. Maybe it's best you do get out on your own, but when you get out on your own, you're going to do it according to our laws, and you're not going to take the furniture and you're not going to take the room and you're not going to take that strip across the front of the house. You get out on your own and we'll give you a piece of land over in the corner here to start. The door will never be shut. You can always come back if you're in trouble." But sometimes, sooner or later, they have to go on their own.

I think Quebec is ready to go, not because I want it to go—I think it would be terrible for it to go—but because it feels that it should go. We cannot continue to give them the gifts that they have already acquired. In the past 10 years, Quebec has gained more socially, culturally and economically than it had in the hundred years previous to that, simply by saying, "Give it to us or we're going to leave." Each government that has had a majority vote in Canada over those years has been dependent completely upon Quebec for the majority vote and it has been held to ransom.

I do not want to see Canada break up. I am a Canadian, but I think that if they are going to go, Canada has to say: "These are the conditions. Within 90 days you either come to the table and you sign like an equal partner, like every other province, or every federal MP from Quebec is gone." No more House of Commons representation for them, no more salary. Every Senator from Quebec is gone—no salary, no entrance into the Senate. All federally funded projects in Quebec are gone; they are cut within 90 days.

Then you say Canada constitutionally has the right to set the new boundaries when a province leaves Canada. I think we are all aware of that. If you want to know what the boundaries I feel should be, you go from James Bay in the northwest of Quebec, straight down along the current border until you reach the Ottawa River, then southeasterly along the Ottawa River, the north shore of the Ottawa River to the St Lawrence River, east along the north shore of the St Lawrence River to the Gaspé coast and then along the border that it now has. The remainder of Quebec would remain Canadian. It has our main Trans-Canada Highway, our main railways. It has the lifeline to the eastern

coast. No problem with an interchange between the new nation of Quebec and the rest of the country; no problem at all. Everything can be kept going right exactly the way it is now. If Quebec ever wanted to come back within, say, five years, all it has to do is come and sign the Constitution the same as every other province.

I feel that this is what should be done if Quebec decides to leave. If we feel that there is no other way, that Quebec is going to leave, we the Dominion of Canada, the nine provinces and the two territories, should set the guidelines and say: "Here it is. You either sign or you're gone." I hate to see that happen, but if it is gone, you have to choose the lesser of two evils and you have to protect your own backyard. You have to protect your own peoples who are left in Canada.

You could easily say: "Any francophone who wishes to be in the new, independent Quebec, all you have to do is travel north across the river. Any francophone who wishes to remain in Canada, the Canadian government will then do everything possible to help you transfer to the south side of the St Lawrence River."

Do I have any time left? That is enough on Quebec.

The Chair: There are a few minutes left. If you would like, you can proceed with your presentation or you could use the time for questions from the members of the committee. It is your choice. I know that there are some questions.

Mr Laffin: I would like to say that there should be a new Senate reform with elected senators. There have been three or four very good models presented by the western provinces over the past five years. That is a must.

We could revamp the marketing boards, which is a federal jurisdiction and which affects the provinces a great deal. Originally marketing boards were designed to gain new markets for our produce. Instead of getting new markets, they have restricted the production to meet the needs, just to meet the markets that we already have. It has destroyed individual initiative in many of our producing areas.

Bank interest rates: Fix them at 9%. They can make a profit on it. Put 3% on it for the deficit, another 0.5% to pay the banks for collecting it. No bureaucracy; the banks already do it anyway. I do not think people would mind 12.5% if they knew that 3% of it was going to the deficit or to any one of the major areas that we need money to spend on.

Our aboriginal peoples: Get them off the reserves. Educate them, get them off the reserves, the ghettos. With a tribal society, you can only expect social, cultural and economic poverty. A tribal society cannot exist in a modern-day society. The native people must be educated and taken off the reservations and shown how to interact with the rest of our society. Until you do that, until we do it, there is always going to be social, cultural and economic injustice for the native peoples.

I will stop at that. If there is time for a couple of questions, I will try to handle them.

The Chair: Yes, probably time for one question.

Mr Harnick: I just want to deal with the very first part of your presentation dealing with the languages aspect. One of the things that you said, you are opposed to

two official languages, or any official languages for that matter, and the one interesting comment you made was something to the effect, let people use the language that best suits them in the place that they live.

Now, in so far as Ontario is concerned, would that mean that you would be content to have Ontario not be officially bilingual but that you do agree you are in favour of Ontario's position being provision of either of the languages in areas where the numbers warrant?

Mr Laffin: Oh, very definitely. I believe in bilingualism. The imposition of two official languages I am against, but bilingualism, very definitely, I believe in it. I think where the numbers warrant, for instance in the francophone communities in Ontario, every effort should be made by government, and the Ontario government especially, to see that these people are not removed from their native language. They should be encouraged; not just condoned, but they should be encouraged in every way.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

KELVIN WINKLER

The Chair: I had indicated to Mayor Winkler that I would give him an opportunity to address the committee at this point.

Mr Winkler: Mr Chairman, members of the committee, it is with deep conscience that I am here tonight and I thank you for letting me address you tonight, not as the mayor but as a citizen of Canada. The reason I bring this out is that when Bill 8 was introduced, a member of our council asked for it to be put on our committee agenda so that he could understand what it was about. The outside media had Kenora as anti-French, bigoted and racist. That is not the case. We are interested in what the wellbeing of the nation is. We are truly supportive of being Canadians and that is what I want to point out here. In the last year or more, Meech Lake and the Oka situation have been dominant on the minds of Canadians. Both have their roles.

1900

When Premier Rae established this committee in his speech in the Legislature, he said it goes back to 1960. He is a little younger than I am. I can remember when I was entering my teens when the Second World War was starting and our residents from here that enlisted were trained in Quebec and came back and talked to us and said: "We think we have a war going on now. It looks like we have one in Quebec that is going to take 50 years to settle." We are coming to that mark now and that is because we did not have strong leadership at the political level. Everything was decided by what is politically expedient, not what is good for the average citizen of that province or of Canada.

When an election is called, by the time results reach Sault Ste Marie it is decided, so western Canada feels it has no part of it. What is not considered is, when the decision is made, how does it affect the average person on the street, not how many seats it is going to present in the next Legislature or Parliament?

The only thing I agree with Premier Bourassa on is that he says there is an overlap of services. There is too much government in some instances and in others there is not.

The municipal level of government is ignored. It is the closest level of government to the people and yet it is ignored.

I tried, with the native situation locally, to form a committee that would have a representative from the federal government, the provincial government, the municipal government and the chiefs. I got the co-operation of senior levels of government, tried to form the committee and met with the chiefs and could not get a native representative. I wanted the programs that were under way by all levels of government, that were overlapping with dollars going down the drain and the average native citizen not benefiting—the chiefs and the higher-ups benefit; they get trips to Toronto and that.

I was disappointed a week or so ago when meeting with the Minister of Natural Resources, who is also the minister responsible for native affairs, when he told me that when the fishing agreement and other agreements came up, the government represents the rest of the citizens. I believe that the government of the province represents all citizens, native and non-native, and I think that until the government gets both sides to the table, we are not going to solve the problems that are facing us.

I think it is time we put a halt to some of these programs and stood back and reviewed what is going on, because we are expending money on every little government for the same problem and not solving it.

I can remember that when the Conservatives were in power they threw out the local children's aid board. The budget, they claimed, was running away. It was \$4 million-plus then. At that time they were going to bring it down and get it under control. Now we have family services that takes over that role and at that time when the local board was disbanded it was taking care of the whole district. I can remember when one woman did all the buying for the children's aid, and she would shop around before she bought a suit of underwear for anybody and get the best price in town.

We now have staff and more staff every year. The budget is well over \$8 million, and besides that you have a separate budget for agencies being set up on the different reserves, so God knows what the total budget is. There is no control over it. Last year they had an overrun of \$750,000 and the municipalities are being asked to pick this up. How many citizens of the municipalities are causing this increase?

Without local input, I cannot see the problems improving. I can only see them going back and we know what has happened in other countries, in South Africa and everything else. They keep bringing South Africa over to look at our situation here. I think it is time we stopped and sat down and got all the parties to the table, and reviewed what is going on, what is working and what is not working. We never curtail programs; we always add. Until we become sensible and think of the person on the reserve or on the street and not what the political outfall of this is, we are not going to solve our problems.

As far as Confederation is concerned, I think it was Premier Rae who said that other provinces have to agree to the opting out of Quebec. The trouble is, with the opting

out of Quebec and self-government for the natives, they always want sovereignty or some tie, but nobody says, when is enough enough on the payout?

I do not begrudge the natives trying to get self-government. I think they are entitled to some recognition, more so than what they are getting, but there is a way that they can be self-supporting and not have to depend on grants. I think we have spoiled them. I do not think we have to blame the natives. I think we created the situation and we have to sit down and try to correct it. Otherwise we are just going to keep pouring into the pot and not solve the problem, but dilute it and spread it. It will be like cancer. It will spread.

We have a problem locally with alcohol and glue-sniffing. One chief came forward and finally came to our council for assistance. That is the type of co-operation we need to solve these problems.

I am rambling on here now, sir, and I will take the advice of my wife when she uses the word "KISS," "Keep it short, stupid." I would just like to close on that note.

Mr Winninger: I appreciate your comments about governments at all levels, national, provincial and municipal, working with our first nations in a co-operative manner. What I am concerned about is your suggestion that the funding that is going to our first nations is somehow being wasted. Would you not agree that we need to fund them in order that they can develop their lands and build an infrastructure and become autonomous and independent?

Mr Winkler: If it is done with review.

Mr Winninger: What sort of review do you suggest?

Mr Winkler: By all levels of government to sit down with them and review each program's worth on its merits. I think they can be self-supporting. In fact I think it can be reversed without really paying taxation to the strong federal government. You know, reliance is a smokescreen, but it also means that they can get on their feet.

Mr Winninger: You say you tried to sit down with them but there were some impediments. I did not really understand what the obstacles were.

Mr Winkler: I think you have to deal with it locally here. I think there is no difference in our levels of government. There is more than one level of government when it comes to the natives also. Each band feels its own autonomy just like each municipality does. Those things have to be understood. It is only normal for them to look at that

I think we spoiled them. When I went to them, they learned well from the white social workers and people who worked with the natives. The first thing they asked me was, "What are your terms of reference for this committee?" I said, "If I came with a set of terms of reference, you would tell me you didn't have a chance for input." I said, "We're coming on first bases." Do not sell the natives short. They are good negotiators and they know how to do it and all the more power to them. I am not trying to run the natives down. I think there is a way we can be better helpful for them to achieve their goals by working together.

Mr Michash: You indicated about representation across the country changing in a way that you would like to see something different. You would like to see politicians,

whether they be federal or provincial, do it differently. How would you suggest change in that system?

Mr Winkler: I think there has to be more input. I think after Meech Lake, if you know why Meech Lake fell apart in the three-year waiting period, it was that Premier Bourassa came out with the "distinct society" questions and then wanted French-only signs on the outside and inside of stores. Then nobody knew what "distinct society" meant. We are now finding out what it means. As long as they can get their independence and still have sovereignty, have their bread buttered on both sides and have their cake and eat it too, that is fine, but there has to be a time when they have to stand up and be self-supporting on that matter, but I think with input, sitting down and seeing what is best for the average person, not the political ramifications only but what is best for the citizens as a whole.

1910

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Mayor, you talked about—

Mr Winkler: Mr Winkler in this case, please.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Oh, yes, I am sorry. You did make that distinction earlier. You talked about the role of municipalities. I presume you are a member of AMO and you likely are a rather significant member. Do they have a northern grouping—I do not know that—within AMO?

Mr Winkler: Yes. They have a local district organization which is meeting on 14, 15 and 16 February, and it is known as the Kenora District Municipal Association. Then there is the Northern Ontario Municipal Association, NOMA, which is the parent group, and then we affiliate with AMO.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay, thank you for bringing that today. I wonder if you are going to make any kind of representation as a group such as that to this important question. You certainly have different problems in the north. You have brought those to us today and I am wondering how you are going to have input into this Confederation process, because I do think as you are saying—I have always believed this, having come from local government myself—that we are closest to the people. We do walk the streets with them every day, and I do feel there is a significant input that should come from municipal politicians on this issue.

First of all, I want to thank you personally for being present here all day today to hear the presentations. Is there going to be input in a formal way from either the northern section of AMO or AMO itself, or do you know that?

Mr Winkler: I was supposed to attend the KDMA, but seeing as I am going to Toronto the following week, I cancelled out, but I have since heard that Mr Wildman and Mr Hampton may be in the bear-pit session. I do not know if I can arrange to drive down to be at that, but I will make every effort.

We also have another association, a loosely formed group up north here, of the mayors of northwestern Ontario, which takes in the Kenora-Rainy River district. We meet every quarter and we are trying to get a representative, Bob Rosehart, who is working with Mr Wildman on

this question, to speak to the mayors there. I do not think we have time to bring that up at the KDMA.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You may want to bring it up to make sure that the northern politicians at the local level are heard on this issue of Confederation.

Mr Winkler: Yes.

KENORA-KEEWATIN DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: Next we will call Dave Canfield, president of the Kenora-Keewatin District Labour Council.

Mr Canfield: First off, I would like to thank you for allowing me to make this presentation. I would also like to thank the committee for its confidence in the intelligence of us northwesterners to put these briefs together in four days.

I would like to make a few remarks on being here today. It was kind of an enlightening experience to say the least. On the opening ceremonies, which as Colin Wasacase told everybody in the room after, you did not understand what was going on and neither did I, and I guess this is part of the problem with all of us. We do not really understand what is going on. I found it very enlightening, some of the other people who have made briefs. There is Mr Blouin coming from two societies, and it is hard for us to understand that.

I will carry on with my brief, and hopefully not bore you, on our role in Confederation and Ontario's role as the labour council views it. I must say that I did not touch base with all delegates to the council, but with the executive, before we made this brief.

Confederation: The definition of this issue is based on a concept, a belief or contract for mutual support for common unified action. One of the most critical issues we face as Ontarians is that we must protect all citizens in our province. Expanding upon that, we as Canadians must protect all citizens in our country. Simply put, charity begins at home. We can protect ourselves by working to reverse the free trade agreement and stopping any deal that ties us into the free trade deal with Mexico.

You do not have to be a rocket scientist to realize that we cannot compete with US wages from \$3 to \$10 an hour. Wages of 60 cents to \$1.20 an hour in Mexico and in the Maquiladora zone would put the final nail in the coffin for Ontario workers. The 230,000 jobs already lost to free trade would double and probably triple in the event of a trilateral agreement with Mexico. Even Canadian business is starting to open its eyes as our economy slides into the worst recession since the Second World War.

We must work to rebuild the walls and fortify the foundations of our society to protect Canadian workers and Canadian business. We can rebuild and fortify by strengthening the Canadian economy, by buying Canadian. It is more than just a nice-sounding jingle; it is something that should be practised with pride and with confidence as Canadians.

What I am going to say now I do not really have in the brief, but a thousand things came to me after I wrote this.

The devastating effects of the job loss due to free trade: I had the advantage of attending a job-loss conference in

Toronto last weekend and it was king of a touching conference. There was a panel of six people who had lost their jobs due to free trade. To say the least, I had to leave the room at one point because of the touching stories that were coming from these people.

I think maybe the corporate executives should come down and work in our shoes and give up the nice three-bedroom house at the end of the street when you lose your job. It is hard, I guess, for anybody who has never come from the grass roots and worked from the bottom. A lot of people do not have the opportunity to climb into a suit and tie, not because they are too lazy but because they do not have that opportunity from their roots.

To continue on, we must protect our pensioners with legislation and indexing of pensions, with pension funds paid by workers who usually have little or no control of their money.

To expand on this also, there are a lot of pension plans in this province and in this country that are overfunded. Myself as a mill worker, we have one of those plans. We have two paper mills with over \$100,000 in a pension fund that we go into negotiations and fight tooth and nail for every time we meet. It is our money. Our company has had a free ride for approximately six years or more. We are the only ones contributing. This situation is throughout the province, throughout the country, with overfunded pension plans. If we had legislation it would cut down on collective bargaining; it would cut down on strikes to have proper legislation to allow us to have proper control or equal control of our money.

Being close to a provincial border, we find an increasing influx of out-of-province labour and construction companies in our market, and although we welcome our brothers and sisters when work is in abundance in this province, we find ourselves unemployed and possibly on welfare in slow times, in the hard economic times we have now. If this practice is to continue, then we must have the same rules and regulations at all provincial boundaries, not to have our boundaries wide open and other provinces closed to our labour market. We are all equal in this country and should be treated that way from coast to coast.

I think Ontario should take a leading role in bringing the country together again, being careful to recognize and take positive steps towards remedying social intolerance which divides and destroys the sense of unity so badly needed to keep Canada a country of many nations and cultures, beyond any one distinct society, working together in an effort to resolve problems, not create more problems with our neighbours.

We just need to catch the latest update on the war in the Middle East to see the horrors that thousands of years of hatred, greed and bigotry have spawned. We must work hard to see beyond ourselves and gain a rich opportunity and insight about other cultures and viewpoints.

1920

Most important, we must want to educate ourselves and our children and work together to create a Canada equal in opportunity for all and strongly oppose politicians from ramming laws through Parliament which make them popular in their own province, heedless of the segregation

and division which seethes in the minds of excluded provinces while breeding discontent and hatred between cultures that are innocently drawn into a power struggle that is wanted and never needed.

We are a multicultural society, many nations within one great nation, with a rich blend of aboriginal, Inuit, French, English, German, Ukrainian, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Scottish, Irish, Vietnamese, Polish, Dutch, only to name a few. If Canadian culture were to be described, I would say that Canadian society is made up of the most precious commodity there is, human spirit, gumption, spunk, determination, drive and strength. Those qualities are made only that much better by bringing to this country the diverse insights derived from various cultural backgrounds. In short, we are all Canadians beyond distinction.

To sum up, the things we should never forget as Canadians, and foremost as we grow older and supposedly wiser, never forget where we come from, as we must all be able to understand what our children and their children after them will have to struggle through just to survive this day and age, as many of us have unfortunately forgotten.

To add to that a little, I guess this goes back to the GST and a discussion that Shirley Carr, the president of the Canadian Labour Congress, had with Michael Wilson about his \$400 pair of shoes, "It is pretty hard for someone like Michael Wilson, who wears a \$400 pair of shoes, to understand that that is over my yearly budget for a family of five for summer and winter footwear."

I think too many of us, even in the working class, as we get our homes paid for—and I see it day by day, in my workplace especially—forget where we come from and forget how hard it is for the young people today.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for a very moving brief. I think you have certainly talked to the subject and brought us up to date from your perspective.

I too know of what you speak when you talk about out-of-province labour and construction difficulties, because I come from the city of Ottawa, where that is a great problem as well. I do think that is one fundamental place where somebody mentioned to us today if we talked about how this would affect the man on the street or the woman on the street rather than political expediency, we would be serving both sides of every one of these provincial borders, and I am glad you brought that forward.

I wonder if you could say a little bit more about what you think the role of labour is here. I was rather disturbed to read this morning that in the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, that labour group is now separating itself from the federal scene and has changed its name and I am talking about the group within Quebec. I am wondering what role you think the CFL or yourselves jointly representing each province can have to try to make Quebec labour feel very much part of the same things as you yourselves feel. I do not know enough about the interrelationship between the different labour councils. Maybe you could help me.

Mr Canfield: To be very honest, I do not know if I can really answer that. I know there are barriers at Quebec. Living much closer to the Manitoba border, it is easier to

reflect on the Manitoba—I hate to put it as a problem. The difference in minimum wages has a lot to do with it. I guess what we would like to see as an organized labour group in Canada is a fair and equitable wage for everyone. I think if we had that from province to province and a decent living standard in every province, we could open our doors wide.

Maybe to explain it in a better way, how government can ever dream that a trilateral agreement with a Third World country can be good—it would be real good if they wanted to bring Mexican wages up to a decent standard of living, but that is not what they want to do. They want to exploit them. Unfortunately, that happens right in our own country. People in different provinces are exploited, in some provinces more so than others, because they just do not have legislation, or we all have different legislations. Quebec has anti-scab legislation; we do not have it here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Do you see a role for labour then at this moment, at this crucial time, or can you bring that to one of your group's gatherings, provincial or federal? I really do think there is a very strong role here for labour.

Mr Canfield: I see a role, speaking locally for ourselves as a labour council. We are in the hardest economic times since the Second World War. I think there is a role for labour and business both to get together and maybe bring some common ground together, instead of pushing ourselves farther apart. I do not know if I am quite answering your question.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think we are thinking on the same vein.

Ms Harrington: I would briefly like to react to some of your comments. First of all, you said to buy Canadian and use pride and confidence when you do. I think that is very well stated. Coming from Niagara Falls, we certainly have a problem with cross-border shopping as well, and I think we have think long and hard about that pride in trying to put our money into Canada.

Second, you stated that Ontario has a leading role to play. I speak for myself that as part of the new government we are finding as we listen to people around this province that, yes, we do have a very heavy responsibility as new people elected in this province, to bring some new light, with your help, on the way things should be going, along with our more seasoned partners, to try to use our power in Ontario for the good of the whole country.

The last comment that I noted, you said various things about the way workers are treated. It reminded me of a couple of presentations we heard this afternoon. First, one man said that the white man's way is power, control and domination. Obviously, he was referring to government and our whole society, the way it is structured. That is something that I think all of us have to think very long and hard about. I think most of the new people in government would agree with me that we were elected to try to change that, that we have a mandate. Our roots, as New Democrats, come from the social gospel movement, which is co-ops, which is getting people together, treating people as equals.

I would like to just let you know that we have only been in government now for three to four months and it

has been many, many years that we have not been in government, so I am asking you to bear with us and to look forward to the future with hope that things can be changed.

You also made note that there are many other members of the government now who are women and who come from a worker's background, and I think that is something very positive.

I want to end by saying that this afternoon another man stated about how he wanted the ordinary men—and I would like to also add women—in this province to be listened to. I would just like to say that our government in Ontario, and I include all of us in the Legislature, I believe, are ordinary people. We want to speak for you and work with you.

Mr Offer: Just a short question. First, thank you your presentation. In response to Mrs O'Neill's question in terms of labour law, I believe I heard you state that there is a fairly large variety of labour laws that run from province to province, be it anti-scab legislation in one province, minimum wage in another and a whole variety of pieces of legislation in between. I think I heard you say that maybe one of the difficulties that labour has is that there is not a uniformity across the country dealing with those aspects of legislation.

My first question is whether that is correct, whether you feel it would be in the best interests of labour that there be a uniformity of labour legislation across the country. I say that because, as you know, there is a distinction between provincial responsibility and federal responsibility, and labour legislation in the main falls within the provincial responsibility.

1930

We hear many models and examples being put forward which seem to be a reduction of federal power. What you are saying seems to be that in the area of labour legislation maybe there should be an increase in federal power so that there can be a uniformity of this action across the country. I guess my question is, is that your position and how do you see that working?

Mr Canfield: If we are to open our borders up in Canada from province to province, then yes, we definitely need legislation that is equal from province to province. I do not really have a problem with that. As I stated before, we do not have a problem with our brothers and sisters coming from out of province when there is a lot of work. We are not saying we do not want them here. We are just saying that as Ontario taxpayers, and setting down the tax base of this province, we definitely should not be out of work and have other people working in our place.

I can give you an example, with no names or companies, of an outfit from out of province that had people working down here on a job. These people happened to get into a conversation with someone who was involved in the labour movement. They said: "You know, that guy's a pretty good guy to work for. He's allowing us to work 12 hours a day." He was paying them \$7.50 an hour and no overtime, but they thought he was the greatest thing since sliced bread because he was allowing them to work 12 hours a day. I have a different word for that man.

Mr F. Wilson: I would like to talk to you in your capacity as the president of the Kenora-Keewatin District Labour Council. I know you are dedicated to the workers of the area, so I feel quite safe asking you this question. You have spoken here about the many things that are burdening the workers today—the GST, the possible three-way deal with Mexico and a few others. In spite of all that, you also talk about the pride and the confidence of workers. What I would like to know is, and I think this committee has to know this, do you feel that pride and confidence are still there? Do you feel that they still believe in Canada and that they still believe in Ontario?

Mr Canfield: I think it is there more than ever. For some reason, I do not know why, when hard economic times come, we seem to buckle down and even take more pride, maybe because we have to. We are all human beings. When you buy a Canadian-made sweater, such as I am wearing, or when you buy a Canadian hat, you can wash it in the washer and you can wear it again. If you buy a Taiwan hat and wash it in the washer, you throw it in the garbage. Sure you pay more; you have to pay more for quality.

Mr F. Wilson: How do they feel about the province itself, about Ontario as an entity, and Canada as a political entity itself?

Mr Canfield: I am not really sure I understand the question.

Mr F. Wilson: We are out here searching for answers to a lot of questions; we do not know the questions, in some cases. We are trying to get to the grass roots of the feelings of the people of Ontario to help us in our deliberations. I am just wondering if workers, even through the hard times we are going through, still have that pride of being a Canadian and that pride of being an Ontarian.

Mr Canfield: Definitely, I would think they do. As you say, we have a grass-roots government now. Maybe it will bring the pride out more or maybe it will bring the people out more. Maybe it will bring more response because we figure we are going to be heard. I do not really know.

Mr Bisson: You said something that really strikes a chord in regard to equality. I think the view that your labour council is putting forward is one that is quite thought out in regard to equality. What you are saying, if I understand correctly, is that we have inadequacies within our own nation with regard to trade from east to west, across borders of provinces.

I take it what you are saying is that in order to make things a level playing field—as they like to use the term as what you are advocating—rather than bring those who have more down, is to be able to bring those who have less up. I would like you to maybe expand on that a little bit because I think it is a message that has to really be spread. You are perfectly right in regard to trade with the Mexicans; we put ourselves in a situation of having to compete head to head with an employer who is paying his employees 75 cents an hour, compared to maybe \$15 or \$17 an hour up in this area, along with benefits. We know who is going to win out. How do we get to that? How do we get

the Mexicans, for example, if we get into a free trade agreement, to come up or whatever?

Mr Canfield: I guess in our own back door in the last few years, with the women's movement for pay equity, we have definitely been moving closer to an equitable workforce. We do have a long way to go. As the Premier said in his statement at the conference, you must be patient; it is not going to happen overnight. I think the average worker understands that. I do think we are going in the right direction. It is trying to be done by the Canadian Labour Congress, by other labour organizations, the Ontario Federation of Labour.

There have been talks with Mexican labour people, as we did with the free trade agreement, not to tell the American workers that we are against them. We are not against them. We are not against the Mexican people. We want to see them thrive and we want to see their standard of living increased. But when you have a government—it has been in power there for, I believe, 62 years—which, unlike Nicaragua, as bad as the injustice is there, does not even allow outside people to come in to monitor its elections, and the Americans stand by and say, "That's okay." But to get involved in a war in the Gulf, that is not okay, there is a suppression there. But it is okay in Mexico because it comes in with their corporate agenda and the manipulation of workers.

Mr Bisson: I would like to thank you for the presentation that you made. It is quite thoughtful. I would like to point out to the district labour council in the area that I am wearing a Canadian suit, so I am preaching the principles. I would like to thank you seriously for the presentation because I really think this is the key of what you are talking about and it is a good direction. In order to achieve equality, it is not a question of trying to push somebody down to get it equal but trying to bring the other up with us, and maybe at the end of the day we will have our place under the sun.

Laurie Normandeau

The Chair: I call now Laurie Normandeau.

Ms Normandeau: Good evening. My name is Laurie Normandeau, and while I work for a Canadian union and I am associated and affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress through our labour council, I am just appearing here on behalf of myself as an independent and as a very concerned citizen. I would like to present my brief now regarding general overview of how I view some of the most critical issues facing our great country.

I believe Canada is a country in crisis, a crisis emanating from the lack of positive, progressive federal leadership. In order to change our great country for the better, for indeed the status quo can no longer remain inert, nor can it be considered non sequitur, we must first examine some issues, the resolution of which may provide a catalyst for that change.

My first issue concerns social intolerance. Legislation has been passed to supposedly ameliorate the perceived injustices and inequities with which Canadian society is challenged. However, while the essence of such legislation is an ameliorative step in a progressive direction, it is at

best a Band Aid solution to an ancient haemorrhaging malignancy.

That malignancy, unfortunately, feeds upon legislative weaknesses and rationalizes an attitude which supports social intolerance, which results in a perception of inequitable sovereignty, a perception of pay equity legislation creating employment inequity, a perception of aboriginal rights abrogating taxpayers' rights and the perception that divergent climatic topographical influences create a regionalistic distribution of wealth and benefits, to the exclusion of regions in need of such wealth and benefits.

1940

I have named only a few contributing factors which influence the average Canadian's motivation relative to his desire to establish a cohesive, unified federation working towards the betterment of all. But how do you change the attitude of people who over decades have been conditioned to think only of their own needs and wants? Government cannot simply legislate the way a person thinks, so the onus remains within each and every Canadian individual's power to change those intolerant attitudes. As the late Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "There is little hope for us until we become tough-minded enough to break lose from the shackles of prejudice, half truths and downright ignorance."

My second issue concerns regional and cultural disparity. While legislation can provide support for the much needed attitude change regarding enhanced social tolerance, the provincial and federal governments must also make strident efforts to alleviate regional and cultural disparity. It has long been recognized that the glut of wealth and seat of power are centred in the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal corridor, while the needs of the many are sacrificed to perpetuate the wants of the few. This creates the perception of elitist distinction, hardly conducive to resolving inequities which arise due to unequal distribution.

I urge you to listen to the essence of what will be presented to you in terms of employment, distribution of government funds allotted for educational, social, health and welfare enhancements, environmental protection and transportation needs, to name only a few. Then compare the austerity from which these needs arise with the rationale given to enhance the serviceability of the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal corridor. I would suggest that the Senate be comprised of a working group—and I want to emphasize the word "working"—of elected officials to assist regions of need, instead of being comprised of appointed individuals being pandered to while slipping their dotage away in an ivory tower of nepotism.

My third issue concerns job protection. In order to promote Canada's competitive edge on the world market, we as Canadians must ensure that the incentives for promoting the marketability of our products are in place; simply put, to make sure our products are as economical and as good if not better than the next guy's or country's. I would suggest that the federal government insist that restrictions be enforced to defeat globalized exploitation of cheap labour markets in developing countries like Haiti.

Case in point: Nearly 300 American companies currently operate factories in Haiti, paying their workers a

meagre \$2.55 a day, with a dictatorial overlord who kills people who seek, and indeed need, wage increases.

Like it or not, pivotal to Canada's economic security and success is Canada's interdependence with the United States's ability to compete in the globalized market, thus decreasing Canada's economic autonomy while increasing her vulnerability at the whim of the American initiatives to create more for less.

Case in point: The trilateral trade agreement between the US, Canada and Mexico, while a temporary boon to the United States, will become Canada's bane as disagreement wreaks its irreparable devastation by dissolving thousands upon thousands of Canadian jobs. Notice I said "temporary boon to the US," for Japanese investment in the Mexican labour market, from decades of perfected management tactics combined with an increased ability to pay higher wages, are stealing the American labour market. The US simply cannot compete with its Japanese counterparts, who offer not only higher wages but enhanced amenities for the Mexican employees. The only positive thing to emanate from the struggle for labour is that employees are finally starting to be compensated and recognized for being the most valuable and precious resource they are.

With the Japanese economic influence drawing the much needed labour market away from the American companies in Mexico, the US will once again experience its own tailspin of non-competitive economic decline. Canada's role in this exercise would only further underscore the folly of having signed her autonomy away by endorsing the trilateral trade agreement, leaving in its wake economic consequences of severe proportion. Ontario, long recognized as being the heartland of Canada's industrial region, would suffer the most job loss devastation.

In summary, I believe that Canadians already possess the tools of ingenuity, intellect, creativity and compassion to strengthen their country by building bridges with tolerance and demolishing walls of prejudice and hatred, by demanding elected, responsible, functional representation in a Senate comprised of individuals dedicated to the people instead of the biased interests of an elitist political entity, and by lobbying for protection of Canada's competitive place within shrinking global borders. While I have not even scraped the surface of Canada's dilemmas, which are legion, I believe the fundamental concerns I have presented are those which are of most critical import.

Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express these concerns, as I trust you will find them reiterated throughout our province. I wish you well in your endeavours and would like to encourage your continued efforts during your quest on how to change Canada for the better.

Ms Churley: Thank you for your paper. I am very interested in what you had to say about labour. It seems to me that there is starting to be a bit of a pattern in what we are hearing. That is something I think I heard a lot during the failed Meech accord, that is, that although we have had different agreements about Quebec and how Quebec should fit into the Constitution, etc, there is an overwhelming sense that we have an awful lot of inequity to take care of in Canada that has nothing to do with the problems between

Quebec and the rest of Canada. There is an overwhelming concern about the economy and the kinds of things you are talking about. I guess I am asking you if that in a way is what you are saying, that the working people of Quebec have the same problems as the working people in the rest of Canada and the inequities between women are the same in Quebec as here, and natives all over the country. I get a sense that that is what you are saying here. I just wanted to clarify that. I told you, obviously, what I think.

Ms Normandeau: Basically, that is what my main focus is. We are all human beings, and as such we all have the same needs, the need for equitable justice, and when the fine, intricate balance between need and fulfilment of need is not attained there will always be the perceived intolerance built up between the two dichotomies, I believe. Until the tolerance level is really examined and, I believe very strongly, until our attitudes are changed towards our neighbours, not only across the borders of our provinces but also our neighbours culturally, we are not going to progress until we can transcend our own differences. In fact, I think the differences can make us stronger because of the diversification and the richness, the wealth that such differences can bring to our lives.

Mr Beer: I have two questions. One I put from another perspective just because I want to try to see if we can get a better sense of what you are talking about, in the context of, as you put it, the glut of wealth and the seat of power in the Toronto-Ottawa-Montreal area. Let me put it in sort of the greater Toronto context. I suppose if you were an ordinary working person living in that area, many people might be coming at it from the other perspective, saying: "Look, we need more services. We need more child care. We need a whole series of things." People are perhaps looking at money from their perspective and saying it is going to other places when in fact the population is there. How do we begin to bring people together to have some kind of understanding of the needs in the northwestern part of the province, while the numbers in terms of population are perhaps not similar, but the very fact that there is a smaller number of people in a much more spread-out fashion with its own particular geographic problems—the nature of winter and so on; there will be needs there, too.

1950

It seems to me we get into this sort of ping-pong match, with the greater Toronto area being the kind of place all Canadians love to hate, yet there are, I think it is fair to say, some particular problems that have arisen in not only Toronto, but Montreal, Vancouver and the large urban areas, and somehow we have to deal with that.

I would like to link that to your suggestion about the Senate to deal with regionalism. I suppose when the Senate was first created, the idea was that it would be, to a certain extent, a place you could speak on behalf of the region. I just wondered if you could expand on how you see that Senate you denoted comprised of elected officials could assist regions with needs, instead of being comprised of appointed officials. Do you have a sense of how you would see that Senate being elected and how it might deal

with some of those regional disparities, some of the ones I described?

Ms Normandeau: I will reply to you with another question: What would happen if Toronto General Hospital, Mount Sinai, Women's College Hospital and the whole hospital corridor along University Avenue all suddenly shut their doors? Who would represent those individuals, the patients, the clients who use these services? We have such a situation north of us. In fact, one of the women scheduled for tonight is unable to attend because of the situation arising. This situation arises in Red Lake, where the hospital facilities up there are very much in jeopardy. The Ontario government is very much aware of the situation. We are looking at a community that may be without hospital facilities. Maybe not thousands or millions of people, but certainly the lives of hundreds of people would be affected by the closure of such a hospital, if and when it does occur.

How would it affect the Toronto corridor of hospitals, say, on University Avenue in comparison to the Red Lake situation, should there not be strong representation by a body of individuals or an individual, such as a working senator to monitor the situation, to bring that priority forward and to have it addressed, instead of having all this lobbying going on? Does that answer your question with my question?

Mr Beer: I think we need to find the answer in both places.

Ms Normandeau: I think so.

Mr Eves: I want to thank you for a very well-thought-out and well-presented brief. You have expressed yourself very well indeed.

On page 2, I think you make some very good points about a needed attitude change regarding enhanced social tolerance, and you talk about the need to alleviate regional and cultural disparity, both from provincial and federal governments. You go on to talk about what Mr Beer was just bringing to mind again, Senate reform. I can tell you, having served on the previous legislative body to this one on Senate reform, your thoughts are excellent and better than a lot of so-called experts in the field. I think what Canada indeed does need is some real, true, regional representation in all parts of this country to reflect some people in this country who perhaps are not represented by a traditional means of electing both MPPs and MPs.

I wondered if you had any thoughts or advice to give us of a similar nature on the province of Quebec and the proposal it has recently introduced or supposedly is about to introduce if it is adopted by the government of Quebec, with respect to what it perceives to be a new federation or a new Canada or at least its proposal of what a new Canada should look like?

Ms Normandeau: That is almost a nebulous type of situation to put in front of me at this point because of the fact that nothing has been put in place per se. Until something has been, and that federation has been tangibly formed, it would be almost presumptuous, I would think, to even consider what form of senatorial representation should even take place, if in fact that would be what it is,

rather than maybe a working committee to bridge the transformation, first of all. There are going to be adjustments certainly.

Mr Eves: I guess I did not express myself very well. I was not looking for a set of rules you would follow if such a federation were to come about. I just wondered what your personal reaction was to it and how you think we, as provincial legislators here in Ontario, or perhaps federal legislators, can respond to Quebec. They obviously have a need they feel has not been fulfilled in the current form of Confederation. I wondered if you had some thoughts on that, as you had, I think, some excellent thoughts on Senate reform and social tolerance and alleviating regional and cultural disparities.

Ms Normandeau: Assuming that their separation is complete, is this what you are asking me?

Mr Eves: No, I am not assuming that at all.

Ms Normandeau: I think I would have to have a little more complete scenario. I have all kinds of ideas, and I do not think our forum here would really permit me all these.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are out of time.

THOMAS KEESICK

The Chair: I call next Thomas Keesick.

Mr Keesick: Good evening. I would like to thank the three parties, the members of Parliament, for allowing me to voice my opinion on what is happening today.

My voice is centred on what is happening with the native populations within the Grand Council Treaty 3. Two or three weeks ago, there was a youth march here in Kenora in which my two boys participated, aged 13 and 14. That is what it is going to centre upon, but first I would like to quote what was said here more than 15 years ago by an elder who lives on my reserve, Archie Lands, "You may throw me out of your restaurants, you may throw me out of your hotels, but you cannot throw me out of Canada, for this is my home."

However, the inevitable seems to be happening now, because of what is happening with the crisis we have in the Persian war. We now have, in our reservation, notices preparing our young people to join in a war that is not ours. I strongly feel that in order to put a stop to what is happening today, it is to put more emphasis on what the native people think within their own area of their lifestyle.

We hear talk on the news media about the Geneva Convention being violated. I would like to remind people of the Parliament that our treaties are also being violated. Long before the war started, we had a peace treaty with the United States, and I believe as well with Canada. We were fighting for who had legal title to the land, a land in which native people, by far, were environmental participants. We have lost that war because we have signed a paper that we did not know on how that treaty would be formulated, as to how we will become self-sufficient again.

Today we have people in much higher-categorized positions, namely, Prime Minister Mulroney, President Bush, Saddam, fighting for what? Oil. I believe members of the United Nations, members of Parliament, can stop this by

simply dealing not only with people who have already established a well-recognized area in their own means of survival, but also the smaller people, such as native people, the smaller businessmen. They have to listen to their opinions as to how we will see fit and possibly to stop the war that is happening.

2000

In 1974, we tried starting what we called the Ojibway War Society. I believe we had established something that not only the municipality of Kenora but I believe nationwide—we too are people of this country. We must stop and utilize whatever means, tools, we have in order to begin to understand who we are and what we are here for. We are being forced to enter an agreement that has been highly overemphasized, I believe, by our Prime Minister, by entering an agreement in which they are forcing native people to become part of something that we or that they did not want to become part of before something like negotiations have been done with native people.

I hope what I have said here tonight will be heard and something will be done about it, because I speak for my reserve that does not get any formal place in Parliament to be heard. I think this is the right time for me to say a bit on what I have been longing to say in front of a group of people that might do something that will ease our minds and say that people in authority are trying to do something to nullify problems that are indigenous in our country.

Mr Winner: I appreciate the force of your comments. I know that many of the native people have been decorated war veterans who travelled by canoe thousands of miles to enlist in the First World War and the Second World War. Do you believe that the time has come now for the first nations people to be consulted with prior to a declaration of war, and I mean a consultation other than through elected representatives to the House of Commons?

Mr Keesick: What I am about to say now may be followed up by either members of our leadership here in the District of Kenora in Grand Council Treaty 3. I believe you know it is quite on the contrary to say native people have been given the sole right to voice out their opinions, because when that happens—I do not believe anything has been done to achieve that initiative to go ahead. But if you are talking about now being the time, then I believe that we are bound by a jurisdiction problem. In order to have that nullified whereby it will give native people a chance for what you are referring to, that is, to be given major authority in legislation, if you are speaking in terms of a constitution law.

Mr Winner: I am just curious how you see that evolving, how you see your involvement on the native level evolving in terms of, say, declarations of war or other federal initiatives.

Mr Keesick: I believe national native leaders should be consulted with before any step is being made. First of all, before enlisting native people into—again, I will recite—a war that is not even ours.

Mr Bisson: In regard to native representation, I take it in both federal and provincial Houses, how do you see that happening? At the end of the day, if a system like that was

to be put forward, what kind of forum would you see as far as native people getting their voice into Parliament is concerned? How would you see that process?

Mr Keesick: I believe, again, I would have to go on by recognized elected native leaders, to talk with the external minister, Joe Clark, on how to implement a far-going prosperity in terms of how we become involved. We have already been made participants to the war, but I do not think that is fully the end result of native people wanting to be part of what has already happened.

Mr Bisson: But in regard to native representation in our parliaments, having members of provincial parliaments or members of federal parliaments who are representing natives from native communities, how do you see that happening and what kind of process would you see? Would it be an election on reserves across all parties? How do you see that happening? Has any thought been given to that?

Mr Keesick: This is a highly explosive question you are asking me here. I believe what has to be done is to have native leaders given some authority as to how we should be maintaining our lives to become economically competitive as well as to maintain our culture. I believe the only way that can be achieved is that we should have more people sitting where you people are sitting now.

Mr Bisson: Let's pray for the day that happens.

2010

RICH GREEN

The Chair: Next we have Rich Green.

Mr Green: I would like to thank Brad Kelly for making way within this group to make this presentation.

I am not altogether enthused by the lights and cameras, but I think I have a difficulty to try to convey to the sitting today. I bring you to the issue of justice and corrections in the first nations community. This issue brings about many areas of concern. In this field, first, I wish to remind this committee that the consistency of utilizing the self-determination, the self-government position is also fostered by the urban native community.

I take you to page 13 of the discussion paper where it states, "Improvements in the quality of life within aboriginal communities." I only wished that was changed to say, "Improve the quality of life of aboriginal people." I find that statement too restricting, making implications to define the limitations this government wishes to pursue, saying not to exceed the boundaries of first nations' communities. I find that statement totally unconstitutional.

I am presently employed by the Indian Friendship Centre in Kenora and I am the native inmate liaison worker. I would like also to bring you to a scenario of native men or women who finds themselves incarcerated in one of our Canadian prisons. The centre is where we send them so they will rehabilitate and take advantage of all the programs that were inspired by the report of the standing committee on administration of justice and the Solicitor General on its review of sentencing, conditional release and related aspects of corrections. Upon reviewing the standing committee's report on justice, it does not adequately

reflect first nations' concerns, but the ongoing products of the absence of first nations' participation.

Today in our provincial system there is the temporary absence program and the Ontario parole program based on values alien to the first nations' communities. I bring you to institutions where 70% to 80% of the population are native people. The only other problem that exceeds these percentages is unemployment, which sometimes reaches 90% in communities. There are 3% being employed by the ministry today.

The suggestion I wish to make is that the committee strongly undertake a road into sensitizing the corrections system. As you see, in the first nations the difficulties are not only confined to corrections, but it certainly is a catch-all for the way we deal with first nations' problems.

We need to look at the other social service fields and the first nations would like to undertake and assume the jurisdiction, management and control in the field of corrections also. We wish to suggest initiatives to be taken to invite first nations' involvement, not only in the historic way of doing business of implementing things and conceding by a government alone, but by the genuine participation of first nations groups and communities. I would like to thank this sitting today.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for the presentation. Could you please share with me what you feel the role could be of the Indian Commission of Ontario in identifying issues and in presenting those issues, not only in terms of all first nations, but also in terms of the way they see the relationship that Ontario should play in this discussion of their role in Confederation? I would like you to share with me your thoughts on the role that the ICO might have.

I say that because in this very first day we have had a number of representations made on some very important issues dealing with first nations persons, be it in family relations, in culture or in a whole raft of social issues. I am wondering if we might be able to use the ICO as a vehicle in presenting those types of issues as they apply throughout the province.

Mr Green: I understand the structure of the ICO. We also feel that it has only been a sounding-board. We felt at different times that their hands were tied too, and when a problem was defined at that level, inadequate resourcing was always there and we could not pursue the issue any further. Obviously, you know, the native community goes backward. They fight among themselves and go inwards, and we have no way to address these things. That is the way government has been dealing with native issues historically: leave it long enough and it will go away. But it does not go away.

Mr Offer: If the ICO is viewed at this point as being a sounding-board—we are now in the early stages of looking at what Ontario's role should be in Confederation. We are looking at identifying and addressing a whole raft of interests and needs and of ways to address those needs. Is it not the time now to say, and I put this forward not as a suggestion but rather for your response as something more than a sounding-board, if that be the case, that there is a

very definite and structured role that the ICO can and maybe should play at this point in time?

Mr Green: Because we understand that the federal government is responsible for native people, first nations people, and also we understand that the Ontario government has interests in the native issues. I understand the native community sometimes is reluctant to undertake that process for different reasons, because our interests tend to be watered down and something else comes up.

On the very issue of natural resources, we look at the town of Kenora. Boise Cascade is the biggest employer here, and I wish to bet anybody at the table tonight to find how many native people work in there directly at the mill. I would say it is insignificant. We talk about the fairness in dealing with resource management and, if it is not exercised now, how are we going to suggest that in the future in any process, ICO or otherwise?

Mr Malkowski: Just to follow up, I certainly enjoyed your presentation. On one of the points that you made you said that it was very important that we as a committee take a look at self-government when we are talking about the Constitution and also to be looking at the criminal system, the justice system, and acting in some sort of co-ordination with the first nations. Can you think of a statement or way that that could be dealt with so that it would actually be covered in the Constitution?

2020

Mr Green: We are suggesting initiatives to be undertaken to invite first nations involvement at the senior level. We want to get away from just assuming contracts developed by the Ministry of Correctional Services at this stage. We want to be party to the development of policy and directives in that system to ensure that the culture and the values of first nations people are considered.

Mr Harnick: You have touched on some points that I think are subtle points and just for my own clarification, in your capacity with the Indian Friendship Centre in Kenora I believe what you were saying was that you are seeing a lot of the problems of native peoples off reserve. In your reference to page 13, when you talk about improvements in the quality of life, you are saying of aboriginal people generally, not just within aboriginal communities—you are talking about improvements of life for those not living in aboriginal communities, and I gather as well that you are talking about improvements in the system of justice, not just on the reserve. You are also talking about some of the difficulties that natives have dealing with the justice system off the reserve. I gather as well that you are talking about the difficulty in the rehabilitation process, in that it does not take into account your culture and those things that are important in terms of reintegrating someone into the native community.

Can you elaborate on those things and just make it clear for me and maybe for other members of the committee that in addition to on-reserve problems, you are also talking about the problems native people have in communities such as Kenora, or for that matter in communities such as Toronto?

Mr Green: I think in the context of your handout, we talk about relationships in the country and that was the context in which I was saying this. I should be able to go anywhere in the country, that is basically what I was trying to say.

Of course, many of our institutions, many of the values that were incorporated into the policies of Correctional Services have been off-reserve values. In order to maximize these programs, native inmates are at a disadvantage when they apply for a temporary absence program, they are at a disadvantage when they apply for Ontario parole because jobs are not there, the social fabric is broken up, the economics are not there, and these are some of the standards that are set by these policies.

Mr Harnick: In other words, they cannot qualify for the temporary absence program and they are not getting as much from the justice system as the next person might?

Mr Green: That is right.

Mr Harnick: So what you are really saying, I suppose, and I do not want to put words in your mouth, but on the one hand a white person might be able to get more from the justice system because more is available to him in TAPs, parole guidelines. Are you telling us that in terms of developing a system of native justice and corrections, by the same token there should be aspects built in for native people in terms of the kind of sentencing, the kinds of rehabilitations, those aspects?

Mr Green: If I may bring you a scenario of a young person that was in a flying community up north. All his people, friends or the other people that were jailed with him, are local people. They are non-native and here he is. They got levels 1, 2, 3, 4 to motivate them to get their act together. There is no way to reward this person because of the distance, the economics of it all. There is nowhere to draw from for this gentleman to maximize those kinds of things.

We are suggesting that some programs be conceived from the native community as to what is valuable to them. How do they envision their traditional customary ways of doing the judge's component? That has never come into play at the jail, at our local one. I went there. We talk about having a good relationship with government. Sometimes I do not have a good relationship with that institution to try to resolve some of the difficulties there.

Mr Harnick: Just to close, I thank you for bringing up certain very important aspects of native communities that we had not yet touched on. Your presentation was indeed very helpful.

ELI MANDAMIN

Mr Mandamin: Bonjour.

[Remarks in Ojibway]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I would just like to start out by saying that I would prefer to speak in my language even though we have 40% of the population in this territory who are not provided with translation services, but I ask for your patience and indulgence as I will try and pass my message to you in your language.

First, may I extend greetings on behalf of my community to the members of this committee. My name is Eli Mandamin. I am chief of Shoal Lake First Nation number 39. Our first nation community is strategically located in the area which straddles the Ontario and Manitoba borders. This has placed us in the unique situation of being in the middle of issues such as the supply of water to the city of Winnipeg from Ontario waters. These waters are our ancestral waters. I would like to point out that when our waters were first taken to quench the thirst of the city of Winnipeg, no opinion was ever asked of any of our people as to what they thought of it.

2030

In 1991, our community is on the move. We know that our future lies in us being faithful to our traditions. We know even more that we must work to strengthen our culture to the greatest degree possible. We must continue to resist the continued unilateral non-aboriginal penetration to our land and the suppression of our culture. At the same time, we must also continue to work towards mutually beneficial relationships with non-Indian governments in Canada that are based on the principle of respect.

I cannot emphasize to the members of this committee too much how different our culture is from yours. Perhaps this is why we find it hard to comprehend how the government of Canada has not lived up to the spirit and intent of the treaty agreements it entered into with us. This was to entrench the principles of equality, cultural pluralism, mutual co-operation and respect.

I also cannot stress enough to you the importance that we place on our treaty relationship with the federal crown in right of Canada. When the treaty negotiators came to us, we understood that they would make our ways, our culture and our heritage known to Her Majesty and her Canadian government. Our understanding of the treaty as an agreement of friendship and co-operation between two peoples of equal dignity has yet to be lived up to. We must always call on the federal government to account on this matter. We will never forgo our relationship with them on this.

It is in this context that we expect a renewal of our relationship with non-Indian peoples in Canada to be developed through the constitutional process based on mutual respect for equal partners, which also allows us to come to a greater understanding of each other.

Our treaty, Treaty 3, is now constitutionally protected in Canada. We must now ensure that the meaning and intent as understood by my Anishnabe people and my ancestors is also recognized within the constitutional context.

To the province of Ontario we say this. Work with us and understand our ways, reach practical understandings with us so that we might live in harmony in this northern land; but even more, work to ensure that proper constitutional recognition is accorded to us in present-day Canada. Recognize the bilateral relationship we have with the crown in the right of Canada which must be maintained by us as a treatment through the federal government, that it must recognize the relationship which was to have been established between us. We still wait for this meaningful, true relationship to be established.

Ontario, push the government of Canada to recognize its fundamental ethical treaty obligations to treaty aboriginal nations in Canada. Work with the government of Ontario and other provinces to ensure that treaty rights and aboriginal rights, where there are no treaties, are updated in the Canada context to reflect and respect the unique cultures of the first peoples in this land.

Remember, we are still waiting for our relationship of mutual respect with non-aboriginal people in Canada to be established as we have always envisioned in our treaty relationship with the crown in right of Canada. We ask you, do not step around us any longer. Recognize that we are the first peoples of this land.

We have so much to offer to Canada. The time of dependence must come to an end. We now face an unparalleled environmental crisis in our land. Scientists are talking of value of indigenous ecological knowledge and traditional knowledge. Economists talk of local economies. We have always practised sustainability, even when our cultures and economies have been suppressed by non-aboriginal governments in Canada.

Now we want the opportunity to fully express the potential of our culture in the 1990s. There is much that we can learn from each other. So far, however, we often get the feeling from non-aboriginal people that it is they who will teach us about the future of this country and it is they who will resolve the huge problems that we now face.

We can assure that this will not be the way in which we will find our partnership with non-aboriginal people of this land. It is only through your recognition of our rights and responsibilities as aboriginal people to preserve our cultures and societies entrenched in the constitutional framework of Canada that real substantial progress will be made in this regard.

I thank the Chairman and this committee for allowing me to deliver the message from my people.

Mr Bisson: I have to say that you are right. Unfortunately, over the history of the building of this nation, the first people have not been listened to and we have not had the opportunity to appreciate what native culture is and what it means to Canada, what we can learn from it.

In that light, when you came in and started your deliberation you went to the drum and put tobacco to it. I wonder if you can share with me the significance.

Mr Mandamin: This drum represents my grandfather and I have given him an offering. Before I came into this room, I have given him an offering so that he will stand by me and assist me in trying to have a better communication with you because, as my other brothers have spoken before me, I recognize that there is a communication problem here. It is out of respect that I offer that tobacco to the drum.

Mr Bisson: I think something needs to be done and you are quite right, it is a deplorable situation in this country where we do not understand our first people, do not know very much about the culture, customs and language. You made the point at the beginning, and I think it was a good point, with regard to not being able to express yourself in your own language. We are the visitors. This is your

nation. There is no question about that. I am basically saying that is something obviously we should have thought of.

Mr Beer: I suppose, as you say, at the root of so much of the difficulty we have had over the years has been communication, different times in different ways. It seems to me that one of the things that we as a committee have to try to wrestle with is what kinds of proposals we might make that at the very least will put in process some way of communicating so that the kinds of goals, values, aspirations which you and others today have been talking about can be realized.

I try to go back, as I think one does, on some personal experience and then I want to come back to the comments that Mr Offer was making earlier around the ICO, the Indian Commission of Ontario. A number of years ago, three or four, the Ontario government and a number of the native communities in the social services area began something that I think was innovative and forward-looking in terms of turning over to native communities the responsibility for various social services. I am thinking here of Tikinagon, Weechi-it-te-win Payukotayno and other organizations like these, Ojibway Tribal Family Services whom we heard from this afternoon wanted to deal with those services in another way and that was their right.

2040

The former minister responsible for native affairs in the Ontario government, Ian Scott, and the present minister, Bud Wildman, I think it would be fair to say, share a common purpose in trying to get the discussions around self-government under way and to make them meaningful. How do we really get that started so it can be effective? I think we could, from different experiences, find places where, provincially, we are able to work with you and make progress around different services, but where, quite understandably, because of your treaty rights, which are vested through the crown and the federal government, you are reluctant to get too involved for fear that the federal government will simply say, "Well, you're doing all of those programs—education, social services, health—with the province, so we'll just back right out and you work on it as if you were in effect another municipality dealing with the provincial government."

Where do we go to really get that discussion going? The Indian Commission of Ontario, it strikes me, has been a useful mechanism. Perhaps, as was pointed out earlier, it does not have the kind of teeth it needs. How often have you spoken those words to us, to others like us? In the short time I have been in this Legislature, I am already asking myself if we should not be further down the road. I heard that three and a half years ago in a similar way, and it seems that we get to where we agree on some of the goals, what we are trying to do, but somehow we have great difficulty in putting in place a process. I am just wondering if you have given some thought to that. What is it that we might usefully recommend that would help move along the whole issue of native self-government and a better recognition of your place in a constitutionally protected way?

Mr Mandamin: My first reaction would be that you have to be very serious if you want to deal with our issues. I have found that we have started dealing on some issues and they are constantly put on the back burner. I was a police negotiator and I was a constable for five years and I was a police commissioner for the Treaty 3 area. I had problems at ICO when I was trying to deliver my message on behalf of the people from this area, because the federal government and the provincial government live side by side in Toronto, whereas we are not that accessible. As you heard in an earlier comment from the mayor of Kenora, the chiefs always spend their money going to Toronto. How are we supposed to deliver our message to you in Toronto or in Ottawa? It is very hard. It is not easy. And when we do get there, you only give us about half an hour of your time.

A lot of our answers lie within our communities. Unfortunately, there are different traditions in our communities, as you can tell by our languages. We have different languages. A lot of the answers lie right in the communities themselves. I am one chief who is fortunate, because tradition and culture are still very strong in my community. They lived through the residential school regime, where they tried to destroy my culture and my traditions. I strongly believe that the answers lie right in the communities themselves, and the answers are there. It is just a matter of taking the time and making those aspirations from the community available.

Your question was quite lengthy, and I have a hard time being specific.

Mr Beer: I think you have answered it. With the Indian Commission of Ontario as the structure which brings together the chiefs, the federal government and the provincial government, would you see it, if it were changed so that instead of you coming down to Toronto and Ottawa there was more dealing directly within the community, as a mechanism that makes sense, that can work? Ultimately, I suppose, the federal government has to be involved as well, but is that something we might want to explore?

Mr Mandamin: I guess it is a possibility, but what you are cautioning there is the same thing I would caution you of, that we do not allow the federal government to be at the same level as the provincial government. With my issues that relate to the provincial government, I think these are day-to-day issues, where with the federal government it has been more of a long-term situation.

Mr Harnick: Has your band started to formulate a self-government proposal, and, if so, what can we do to facilitate what you ultimately want that proposal to do for you?

Mr Mandamin: Right now I am in a situation where Manitoba and Ontario were playing games with my community, but fortunately, enough NDP got in and they have been quite receptive to our proposals. As I said earlier, I am in a better situation than a lot of communities; I still have a lot of my elders and a lot of culture and a lot of tradition left in my community, and I feel we can provide an understanding for the environment from the culture and knowledge of our elders. I am in a situation where there is

going to be mine development. Of course, the non-aboriginal people are trying their best to stop us, but what we are trying to say to them is: "Give us this opportunity. We'll show you that we can provide a mine and not pollute the water or not pollute the environment. We feel we have the resources in our communities to do that, but just give us the space we need."

We have problems with our fishing. Our fishing was taken away 10 years ago. Our wild rice was damaged because of the diversion of the water. We have had absolutely nothing. We have just been sitting back waiting for this opportunity, and I feel we have an opportunity. Unfortunately, my community is one of very few communities ready for self-government. It cannot come in a proposal package because we have to develop it at the community level.

MIKE CLANCY

The Chair: The next speaker is Mike Clancy. For members of the committee and members of the public, there is then one other speaker left.

Mr Clancy: If you are speaking to me, I am going to ask you to speak up, because I am a little hard of hearing.

I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak to you as an ordinary Canadian. In a way, you are taking quite a risk, because there is no way of telling what an ordinary citizen is going to say.

I am not a public speaker, so I will read. I cannot ad lib. I have to say that while I was waiting, I was particularly interested in what Chief Mandamin had to say. I thought it was very interesting.

Mr Chairman, members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, people of the Kenora district, I have read the public discussion paper and agree that now is the time to rise above partisan interests—it says in your booklet—to rediscover consensus. I believe that your dialogue with ordinary citizens is essential to bring healing to our country, provided politicians really listen and act on what they hear and provided you can establish a mechanism to ensure politicians continue to listen.

I was born and raised in Ontario. However, I feel more like a Canadian in my identity than an Ontarian. When I was much younger—I had long hair and no job—I hitchhiked throughout Canada, setting foot in every part of it, from east to west and as far north as Yellowknife. Wherever I went I met people who accepted me as one of their own. I felt safe and valued in every part of this country. I should mention that the most generous people I encountered were either poor or native or French Canadian. I hope that my children, as well as their children, will also feel at home in every part of this land and welcome other Canadians in the same way, in one Canada with a strong, federal identity.

However, I think it is important that natives, French Canadians and others understand that they are respected and valued and that their distinct communities have a place within a strong federal system.

I am afraid I answered your questions from the booklet out of sequence.

2050

The first question: What are the values we share as Canadians? My God, I thought you would never ask. You are right in thinking that this is the central issue. Canadians and our institutions are starving for information about the values we have in common.

The other day, I was watching CBC television. They were telling the story that recently a video store in Winnipeg was taken to court for selling pornography. Police had to use as evidence films in which people were apparently beaten on camera to entertain the home viewer. The judge threw the case out of court because of an inability to define whether the videos were actually pornography. The judge, it seemed, lacked information about the values of community standards, information necessary in order to make a determination.

Ontario and Canada need a continuous, ongoing study of existing Canadian values. This includes the values of Canadians as a whole and the values espoused by individual Canadian communities, such as native communities. We also need a mechanism to promote and reinforce these identified values. For example, I have nothing but admiration for the non-sectarian value commercials sponsored by the Mormons and Baha'is. These commercials non-judgementally promote positive, non-contentious family values and peace. There is a terrible vacuum that these people are trying valiantly to fill. They are doing us a great service. It must be cheaper in the long run to study our culture and reinforce its strengths than to deal with the effects of loneliness, crime and mental health problems that arise when cultures erode and people can find no positive identity.

We certainly do not need a values police, and we do not need to create more bureaucracy. You probably want something specific, so what values do we as Canadians desire? Specifically, fairness, tolerance, caring, rule of law, justice, a respect for human rights, negotiation based on principle, not on power or might, and a recognition of the value of work. I believe these are values that we do share as Canadians, no matter what province we live in. There is a very good reason we chose to develop our collective character in this way. I do not presume to give you a lesson on history, but just to explain to you my reasoning in saying this.

Canada has not advertised itself as a melting-pot, as did the United States. Historically, many of the immigrants to the US were opportunists looking for a level playing field. Canada has been a haven for refugees. People who wanted to preserve their religious or ethnic identity fled to Canada because they knew Canada would not suppress their cultures and values, and that the rule of law preceded them wherever they settled, allowing them to prosper. I doubt that the predominantly English and French rulers of early Canada appreciated the multicultural experiment they were engaged in or its results.

This resulting country is one with a cultural diversity similar to the United States. However, the way this cultural diversity operates is fundamentally different. Immigrants to Canada have retained part of their culture and their language and links to their home countries. This allows the

transmission of ideas from Canada to the immigrants' homelands. I wonder what lessons they take home with them? Perhaps the ideas that blood feuds are not tolerated, that women are equal to men, and that culture can maintain itself without conflicting with a neighbour's differing culture. These are ideas born and nourished in Canada and exported to the world.

We need to deliberately create in Canada a vision of Canada for the future, to make this vision a vision shared by all Canadians. Canada has a great mission, if we accept it. Canada is and must be the model of the new world order. That is such a trite saying; I do not know how else to express it. If Canada did not exist, it would have to be invented as a stage or laboratory for the nations of the world to demonstrate to the United Nations that people of all races, religions and nationalities can live together in peace.

Now I would like to skip to question 4. I know it is not in sequence.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? To begin with, it would be grotesque for non-natives to tell natives how we are going to save them. It cannot be done that way. Just a few short months ago, the news media were focused on events near Oka, Quebec. Like many Canadians, I had a sickening feeling that something terrible could happen any second, something that we as Canadians would be ashamed of for generations. Now Canadians are preoccupied with events in the Middle East. What I read in the papers tells me that little has been done since the summer to remedy the problems in Oka and other communities. Everything seems to be back on hold. I wonder what native Canadians might have to do next time just to get the attention of the general public and politicians. In fairness, I do recognize that the Ontario government is making some positive action, but it seems to be alone in that.

Again, how do we achieve justice? First, we admit the mistakes and atrocities of the past. All of society must accept collective responsibility. Although many people may even have even acted from good intentions, the effects are no less evil. Our next step must be to consult with native people and be prepared to listen. We must recognize that natives and Inuit are distinctly different from other Canadians and that they were here before Canada existed. You have heard this all before. We must learn from consultation what values are necessary for native identity; then we must negotiate, based on principles rather than power, a fair approach that is flexible enough to address the concerns of the varied communities.

I believe that whatever shapes are given to the various approaches to nationhood or self-determination for natives, their cultures will have a greater chance for survival within Canada. Whatever definition we give to the phrase "first nations," we must preserve the viability and integrity of my country, Canada.

Legislators will have to deal with a great deal of criticism and will be seen by many as giving a form of preference to natives. The public will have to be educated about the reciprocal nature of any agreement. I am sure that when barriers are removed to expression of native identity,

Canada will experience a renaissance of a vibrant native culture.

Question 6: What is Quebec's future in Canada? There is a future for Quebec within a strong, federal Canada, provided we do formally recognize that Quebec is a distinctive society—as in your booklet—in its history, language, laws, politics, ethnicity, desires, fears and aspirations. As long as Quebec holds this to be true, it is a fact, and the rest of Canada would be foolish not to recognize it. If a population in our country feels it has a cultural identity worth preserving, then this cultural identity should be cherished, because it enriches us all.

However, it would be wrong for Quebec to guarantee its cultural survival at the expense of native, Inuit and other cultures within Quebec. It would also be wrong for Quebec to unilaterally disclaim its relationship and responsibilities to the rest of Canada. Having said that, I do not believe that Canadians in Quebec or elsewhere would be willing to send their sons or daughters to keep Quebec in Canada by force. I believe we have at least that much wisdom, no matter where we stand on the issue.

2100

We need to be generous in dealing with Quebec now. Give Quebec what it needs to maintain its language and its strong culture, but do not weaken Canada's federal powers in the process. We need a made-in-Canada definition for nation, one that will nourish a Quebec identity within this country. If Quebec decides to leave Canada, I believe Quebec should be willing to let go of what it has acquired through its union with Canada, for example, perhaps northern Quebec, where the James Bay power dams are located and the population is predominantly native or Inuit. If they had a say, I wonder what they would say.

Everyone talks about the European common market as a model for a looser Canadian federation. What people seem to overlook is that the wealth and credibility of each state within the common market increases as they acquire bonds and an ability to co-operate voluntarily in a stronger federalism.

How can we secure a future in the international community? I have used the phrase "intersufficiency" because I do not what else to call it. I believe that the existing free trade agreement is not the right direction. We do not need to be interdependent with the United States and Mexico. Instead, we need to build a viable economy and culture at home sufficient in itself, and develop areas of strength to trade with other countries.

We need to rebuild our national culture, institutions such as the CBC. We need to rebuild healthy national institutions to draw us together from east and west and north and south. We need to bring the north closer to us by deliberately rehabilitating one-industry towns dependent on primary industries and resources, and instead create self-sufficient, environmentally sensitive communities with the ability to produce and purchase locally, and perhaps most important, to use income taxes locally to keep the wealth within that community.

It is clear that existing free trade favours only multinational corporations. They have no loyalty to us, or to the United States for that matter, and would cheerfully export

our jobs and pay cheques to any country where production is cheaper. Why should we then give away our resources to them?

It is clear that what I have to offer is a loose collection of ideas. In fairness, I feel that the people of Kenora should have had a little more time to prepare. I actually had to take some holiday time off work in order to do this. I feel that perhaps other people would have contributed if there was more time available. I hope that it would be clear to you that ordinary Canadians are willing to contribute time and energy if you only ask us.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I think, far from being a loose presentation, there is a fair sense of cohesiveness in some of the things that you have put before us. Are there questions?

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. I think you have addressed many of the very issues which we are going to be addressing in the next while. One point which you brought forward stated that there is a role for Quebec in a strong federal government as long as we recognize Quebec as a distinct society.

Mr Clancy: Yes.

Mr Offer: I think that is basically what you had indicated. My question to you is, what if that option is not in the proverbial cards? What if that role that you have brought forward is not an option? I am not saying that it might not be, but you have gone through so many of the questions and shared with us your thoughts, I just could not let you leave without asking, what about an alternative?

Mr Clancy: I cannot speak with any kind of authority on this. During the Meech Lake discussions there were times when people said there were deadlines and they gave ultimatums. There were other people who said: "This is not really a deadline. This is not really an ultimatum." They did not accept that. I think that because one side in a negotiation process, union negotiations or whatever, says "That is the bottom line," does not necessarily mean that it is. It is very often a matter of defending a position.

What I hope we can do between now and that point is to put enough discussion in place that we do not put Quebec into a position of having to defend a hardened position, of having to harden that position further and further to give ultimatums. I think if we can prevent that situation from coming up in the first place by negotiations, that would be the preferred thing to do. I think we can do that.

What if they say, "This is it, we're going"? I still think they have obligations to Canada as a whole. I disagree that they can say unilaterally, "We are leaving." If they were to refer to international law, I believe they would find that they still have obligations to us. Any obligations that have been entered into over hundreds of years cannot be dropped lightly. How this can be done, I am not sure. I am afraid I do not know enough.

FLORENCE BUFFINGTON

The Chair: Our final deputant this evening is Florence Buffington, who is appearing. I think as she will indicate, on an individual basis.

Ms Buffington: Good evening. I must admit that this is the first time I have seen this booklet. I requested a copy of this booklet and the post office refused to give it to me on Saturday, so I guess I will get it tomorrow.

I received a call last Wednesday asking me if I would make a presentation on labour's point of view on the Constitution. After getting in touch with as many activists as I could, I decided it would have to be my own view. Through the channels of communication, I thought I in fact was well read on the history and the conception of what the Constitution accord is all about. After trying to come up with what I really knew about it, I found out how little I in fact know.

Over the course of the next few weeks you, as MPPs, will hear many different points of view, concerns, accusations, hopes and dreams from presenters. There will be little that is new, that you have not heard before. It has been vented and regurgitated again and again, but the process is in the works to hear from the residents of Ontario, and I am appreciative of that fact.

Over the centuries Canada has struggled with changes, as each and every country on the earth has. Changes happen, whether they are for better or for worse, and nothing is stagnant. From the days of Upper and Lower Canada to where we are today, it has changed—industrialization, mass communication, extended lifespans. The list could go on and on, but change happens. Yet the same concerns were with the people when each and every change to the governing of Canada was brought about.

2110

An example of this can be read in the newspaper article of the time. The 1 July 1867 edition of the Halifax Morning Chronicle carried a notice edged in black. The notice read, "Died, last night at 12 o'clock, the free and enlightened province of Nova Scotia." This was because of the swift passage of the British North America Act. At each step of our history, Canada has had areas or provinces that felt that they received the short end of the stick, yet after all the changes, the different conflicts from each province, Canada as we know it is still Canada.

I do not pretend to understand the language issue of French versus English. In my opinion, a language is a tool to communicate, whether it be with friends, family or foe. I do know that on the occasions when I was in Montreal, Quebec City and northern New Brunswick and I had to use the few words of French I have in my repertoire I encountered no hostility or conflicts because I was from Ontario and could not speak fluent French. My accent was atrocious, but I was trying on their turf to speak their language, and for that I was accepted.

Before resolve can come to Canada on the Constitution, Canada must lay to rest some outstanding issues. First, there are the outstanding land claims. This will be a matter not easily dealt with. The mistrust, abuse, the ignorance of the white man concerning the aboriginal people of this country has been a blight on Canada since the days of the voyageur. Canada cannot possibly go forward without settling these claims.

Second, economic security has to be in place. For Canada, the free trade agreement and the GST are but examples

of the federal government ramming down the throats of Canadians something that the majority of the people do not want or understand. If in fact the FTA is now going to be including Mexico, Canada had best be at the table, because there is absolutely no way the Canadian manufacturers can compete with the 60-cents-to-\$1-an-hour labour force. The statement that I hear most often of bringing their standard of living up to ours and Canada's not falling is a pipe dream. I cannot believe there are any truly sane economists who believe this statement. For the regions of this country to service theirs, there must be economic security.

The federal government cannot afford to be neutered by constitutional accord. One only has to look to the south of us to see the effects of the eroded federal government and the added conflicts and discrepancies across the United States, from north to south and east to west. Minnesota is a strong labour state. Wages are high compared to southern right-to-work states. One only has to look at Boise Cascade's expansion project in International Falls, Minnesota, when BEandK came to town to see the effects this can have on a community, from workers coming from right-to-work states. There are vast differences between all states on education, highways, bridges, social assistance—the list could go on and on.

The federal government cannot and should not be left in a situation where it is nothing more than an economic union with the provinces. If the Quebec discussion paper becomes policy, 22 federal or shared powers will be transferred, including manpower, natural resources, health, education and housing and those not specifically assigned in the Constitution, residual powers plus the added areas of exclusive federal jurisdiction of communication, unemployment insurance, public security, energy, environment and agriculture. Quebec will exercise full sovereignty over these areas. The federal government will be left with defence and security of the territories, customs and excise, management of the common debt and currency equalization.

There is surely a way to negotiate with Quebec for the cultural and linguistic security that it feels it needs without the ripping apart of Canada. What will happen? Where will Canada be 10 years from now? Will it have reverted again to Upper and Lower Canada? Will it have turned over the keys of the city to the United States and become the 51st state? The time is now for you as politicians to take this matter squarely on your shoulders and keep Canada Canada.

As a landed immigrant in Canada and a United States citizen, I have only to look at the quality of life in Canada that is afforded to its people and tell you that it is a far superior life than in many of the states in the United States. There has got to be a negotiated settlement between all parties involved for Canada to save itself. Once torn apart, Canada will not mend.

I would only hope that the next time hearings are held on issues as important as this, Fort Frances will be included on your roster even though it is not on the Trans-Canada Highway.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Ms Buffington, thank you very much for coming and presenting for us.

Ms Buffington: I got off work at 4:30 and drove 220 kilometres and have to turn around and drive back to Fort Frances to go to work tomorrow.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Does it make you any happier that we are going to Dryden after we finish this?

Ms Buffington: No, it does not.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We think we have got a long day, as well, though. We will just let you know that. Would you tell me a little bit about your request at the post office for a copy of the document?

Ms Buffington: My local MPP is Howard Hampton and his office had sent some things for us and it had to be signed for or delivered to his office. One of his staff people went to the post office to try to get it for me on Saturday. They refused to release it.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: There is certainly not much federal-provincial co-operation that we would hope for. I find your paper quite insightful. I feel you are very well informed. I am amazed at how much you know about the Allaire report. At least you seem to have picked up quite a bit about this. Certainly, having your background from the United States, you understand that cross-border labour situation. Would you say a little bit to me about what you feel the labour movement can do in responding to the Quebec problem or Quebec proposition, or whatever you want to call what is going to come along in the next few months as we see it unfolding, whether it be from the Liberal Party or the Parti québécois? They are definitely going to be in another mode of thinking, in another level of decision-making in that province, which we will no doubt have to respond to. Can you see a role for the labour movement there and can you see a role for the labour movement in that problem that we have with the United States?

Ms Buffington: Anything I have to say is just my own personal point of view. I am affiliated with CUPE. CUPE is of course affiliated with the CLC. I am affiliated with the OFL. There are so many different points of view. The one that really concerns me the most is what I see that has happened in the southern states, in the right-to-work states, where the wages are so low. You cannot collect taxes if you are not making a decent wage. Then the schools are not funded properly, the highways are not funded properly. That is my biggest concern, that something like that could happen or that a group such as BEandK could end up in Canada or one of the provinces, working and eroding away what the labour movement has fought so long and strong for.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: How do you feel the constitutional crisis or constitutional decisions and options that we have are affected, or how can labour have input into those?

Ms Buffington: I think as you travel closer down east, you are going to have labour people speaking from the different points of view that they have decided on as a unit. I really cannot speak on any of that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for bringing your insight and your perspective to us tonight.

Ms Harrington: Thank you, Ms Buffington, for coming all this way. I noted at the beginning you said that we

were going to hear many different points of view, and I remember on the plane this morning thinking that I do not know what on earth we are going to hear. But now that we have been in Kenora, I think I would like to say that I am glad we started in Kenora, because we have a very wide base to start with, a very important viewpoint. We started with a native ceremony and I think that has helped to try to give us some added wisdom and to try and reach through the presentations for some truth. Certainly, not that we can do that, but that the presenters themselves are bringing things to us.

2120

The first person mentioned the lack of presentation time. Coming to Kenora I think has been rather stressful, because you have not had the time to prepare and so what comes through today is the real reality, without having time to really think about it and go to the experts. What we are hearing is the real truth.

It just comes forward at the beginning, some of those values that you presented, the ones that you brought forward, that there are benefits to being in Canada from a labour point of view. Some of the other things we have heard today are the values of peace, one of our values in Canadian society; the values of the first nations; the values of the French founding people who are very much a part of the fabric of Canada. I think what we have is a firm basis from which to view whatever happens to us as a committee in the next few weeks. What we have heard here in Kenora has been very important to us, to give us a starting point.

I would like to come back to what I heard and that was that the white man's way is power, control and domination. I think that is something that has to change and that is something that we will go through with to the Constitution. Thank you very much for coming.

Mr Harnick: I found your paper interesting in that you made it quite clear it was your belief that the federal government had to maintain a standard, to maintain quality of education, health, etc, on a uniform basis across the country. Is that something that would be consistent with the views of labour?

Ms Buffington: Yes, I believe so. Those are my feelings. I cannot speak for CUPE or the OFL or any of them. But from what I know and what I know even comparing the school system in Minnesota to Alabama or Texas, it is a far superior system in Minnesota because the wages are so much higher and there is something there to form your tax base to support education, and that would not happen if our complete tax base was eroded.

Mr F. Wilson: You have left me one question. Once again, thank you also for your journey to us and I hope you will drive safely going back.

Ms Buffington: A little fast, but I guess I will slip a little.

Mr F. Wilson: I hope we drive safely going back too. You mentioned on page 2 that the federal government cannot afford to be neutered by a constitutional accord. You also refer to the Allaire report. I am sure you are aware

there are several other reports, including our own, that will be in the public domain over the next few months.

There seems to me a feeling I am getting, and I think it is probably shared by many people here within the audience and at this table, that the federal government has, for want of a better phrase, I guess to be kind, lost credibility in order to speak for the nation. Since at some point down the road there is going to be some kind of coming together of all these reports and these commissions, including the federal one also, have you any advice to give, any input? How would you like to see that shape up, remembering the Meech Lake situation, not to be repeated. What kind of an insight could you give into that?

Ms Buffington: My greatest fear for Canada is that Canada will end up being part of the United States. I am an American citizen and I am very proud of that, but my greatest fear for Canada—Canada is different from the United States; it really is. The people are just different and it is a good difference, and that is not necessarily to say that—speaking off the top of my head like this is hard, but Canada is a really unique place. There are so many different cultures. In my area there are natives, Ukrainians, Italians, Americans. I think somebody here mentioned the melting pot. In the United States it was assimilation and everybody should become the same. Canada has tried to keep that difference and I think that is great. They should be allowed to keep their differences.

You think of Canada and maybe you think of the maple leaf or you think of the beaver or you think of whatever, but Canadians are very special people, and you go anywhere in the world and Canadians are seen as peacekeepers. They are not seen as a warrior nation or a devouring nation or out to go and get something that is not theirs.

I feel really badly about what happened with the free trade agreement. I think that was really the downhill spiral starting for Canada, the free trade agreement, and now Mexico is going to be added to that too, and if you listen to Mr Bush, his intent is to go all the way down into South America as to what he would like to see as the boundary. Canada cannot possibly compete with that; you just cannot. When you are looking at the Mexican rate for labour, it is something like 60 cents an hour. Who here can afford to live in Canada in a cold climate, in a one-industry town, for 60 cents an hour?

There is absolutely no way that we are going to bring their standard of living up to ours. That is not going to happen. Canada's standards are going to end up going down and it will be a crying shame. With anybody I talked to over the last few days, I said, "What can you possibly afford to give up in your standard of living?" and nobody could give me one answer of anything he could afford to give up—health care; education; OSAP for their children; there is nothing. It is a shame. I really feel sorry for Canada.

Mr F. Wilson: You are quite right. Canada is a unique people. Part of being a Canadian is being unique. Also, it is part of our problem. Where else in the world could you see this type of situation going on? But that does not give us room for despair. I think there is a lot of hope here too, and thank you very much for your presentation.

The Chair: I am sorry. There were a couple of others we had. We will just have to end it there. It has perhaps been with that hope that we will continue our work. I want to thank you for coming to talk to us and I also want to thank all of the people. This ends our proceedings for this evening. I want to thank all of the people here in Kenora who came out to talk to us about the issues you felt were important.

Although we have only spent less than a day here in Kenora, I think that I speak for the members of the committee in saying that we certainly leave this community feeling much better informed about some of the very deep feelings and views that exist among people from the different communities that make up this city and the surrounding areas. We thank you for coming and sharing those with us.

We will do our best to keep remembering those comments today and do whatever we can, recognizing that a number of the comments touched very clearly on the whole constitutional framework that we will be endeavouring to try to pull some recommendations together on, and recognizing also that a number of points that were made perhaps do not fit neatly into that package, but that is also our role, I think, as a committee, to try to sift those out and to see to it that those concerns get addressed in whatever the appropriate way might be.

We know there was a concern about the process and the time lines and we are very conscious of that. However, I think this was said, that there was also in some ways a benefit to being able to come here and just give people the opportunity to talk to us, as it happened. I think, as I say, though, we are conscious of the process. We do see this as a beginning of the discussion and we will again do whatever we can to ensure that the consultation and the discussion involving people from this community and many other communities across the province continue, in what format we are not quite sure, but that is also part of the task that we are trying to deliver on.

I would say to those of you who are interested in following our proceedings, as you know, and for people who

are also watching us on the parliamentary channel across the province, our hearings continue to be televised. We will be in Dryden tomorrow morning and in Sioux Lookout tomorrow afternoon, and then proceeding on Wednesday to Thunder Bay and on Thursday to Sault Ste Marie.

2130

Before concluding, I would like to thank all of those people who helped to make our stay here as positive as it has been, and certainly among those I would put at the top of the list are the people who fed us today. I thank those folks, wherever they may be, if they are still here and all of those other people who have helped, as I say, to make our stay here both pleasant and positive.

I think a number of people have commented on the beginning of our hearings with the ceremony from Alex Skead, and I hope that we can take, Mr Skead, some of that wisdom that has come through that ceremony with us in the days and weeks ahead. I thank you again for your participation with us today, and thank you all once again. Mr Skead was just telling me that there is a special song and a special prayer that they would like to perform for us in wishing us a safe journey and continued best wishes.

Mr Skead: There is a song that I had in a vision that was given to me in a dream. That song we always have when we go into a big powwow or a big gathering. We call it a travelling song. It was years back about at the time I was working for Kenora on the street patrol. I was there for seven years and I dreamed about the song and it stayed with me. I shared that with the people, and it is well known across Canada and the United States. A lot of our people use that for a travelling song, as they call it, and the words are saying "I am the one who makes you walk," so that is the song that the drum had given me to share with the people.

[Remarks in Ojibway]

The Chair: Thank you. Now we are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 2137.

CONTENTS

Monday 4 February 1991

Give Peace a Chance	C-44
Ojibway Tribal Family Services	C-48
Le Club Chanteclerc	C-51
Don Imbeau	C-56
Walter Kostantin	C-58
Andrew Chapeskie	C-61
John Karwacki	C-62
Evening sitting	C-64
CJBN-TV	C-64
Marlene Brown	C-65
Bill Laffin	C-67
Kelvin Winkler	C-68
Kenora-Keewatin District Labour Council	C-70
Laurie Normandeau	C-73
Thomas Keesick	C-76
Rich Green	C-77
Eli Mandamin	C-78
Mike Clancy	C-81
Florence Buffington	C-83
Adjournment	C-86

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Beer, Charles (York North L)
 Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
 Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Also taking part: Miclash, Frank (Kenora L)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-5 1991

C-5 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 5 February 1991



Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 5 février 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Tuesday 5 February 1991

The committee met at 950 at the Senior Citizens' Activity Centre, Dryden.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. Welcome, first of all, to everyone here. We are pleased, as a committee, to be in Dryden today. This is the second day of our hearings. We started yesterday in Kenora and heard, I think, a number of useful opinions expressed to us about the issues related to Confederation and the Constitution and even some other issues that may not fit into that category. As we indicated yesterday, we were both pleased and appreciative of the fact that we had that opportunity, as I am sure we will also find to be the case here in Dryden.

This committee, as people would know, is made up of members from the three parties at Queen's Park, and I think it is appropriate to introduce the members of the committee. My name is Tony Silipo, and I am the Chair of the committee. From the Liberal Party we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill, Steve Offer, and also joining us is the local MPP for the area, Frank Miclash; from the Conservative Party we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick; from the NDP we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair of the committee, Margaret Harrington, Marilyn Churley, Fred Wilson and David Winninger.

Our role, of course, is to try, as a result of the hearings we will be holding throughout the month of February, to come up with a sense of where the people of Ontario are in their viewpoints on the various issues that touch the Constitution and Ontario's role in the constitutional discussions that will no doubt continue for months to come. We realize in setting out that the work is such that it obviously cannot be truly done in that kind of time frame, and I want to emphasize on behalf of the committee that we see this as the first stage of our work in which, through the hearings, we will get as good a sense as we can in the different regions of the province. We are travelling throughout the province purposefully in that way and we will be looking for ways in which we can continue the discussion in the months to come, perhaps through other means of involving the people of the province in talking with us about some of the changes and some of the viewpoints that perhaps need to be taken into consideration in making those changes to Confederation.

TOWN OF DRYDEN

The Chair: I want to begin by inviting the mayor of Dryden, Mayor Jones, to say a few words to us.

Mr Jones: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of the committee and guests here, on behalf of the citizens and council of Dryden, I want to officially welcome you to this little town. We note that we are not marked on the map, but that is all right.

The Chair: Actually, you are. It may not be appropriately located.

Mr Jones: It is not. In any case, I gave you each a package which shows where we are. We call ourselves an oasis in nature's northern wonderland; that is Dryden. We welcome you and I want to say that this little town has a future. It is great now. It is going to be greater. We have forests around us that are regenerating. We have a high-tech, modern pulp and fine paper mill here as our main industry, and we are looking for further progress as we proceed.

I want to thank Frank Miclash, our local member of Parliament, for keeping us informed as to the visit of your committee, and I am very pleased you selected this building as your meeting place. It may be a little small and that sort of thing, but it is the centre of activity for our senior citizens of Dryden and our club, the Dryden Go-getters. This is a very special club in the town of Dryden, our seniors' club. They look after themselves and do not come to council for any help, financial or otherwise, so it is great.

Our council did not really have much time to do any in-depth study of this meeting, so while we would have liked to present a more detailed item, I am going to take this opportunity—I will come back to speak personally for myself a little later in the program—to say that our council spent some time on your visit and did arrive at five points which council would like to put forward to you at this time. I am going to ask Councillor Susan Wells to present the five council points to you.

Ms Wells: The council of the town of Dryden, on behalf of the citizens, has authorized this statement to be made.

First, a united Canada is best for all citizens and should not be negotiable.

Second, another meeting should be held by the federal government with the provinces and the territories represented, in public, with no more closed meetings.

Third, any agreements made by the parties concerned should apply to all. Specifically, any agreements made with any of the provinces by the federal government should apply to all provinces and territories.

Fourth, aboriginal discussions regarding land claims and self-government should be held and, since the governments are the arbiters with power of decision, a representative group of non-native northern residents should also be at the bargaining table.

Fifth, bilingual and multiculturalism policies should be reviewed and agreed to by the provinces with the general acceptance of the citizens.

Council realizes this is a simple statement of a very complex situation, but we wish the points to be considered by Ontario, and Ontario will have our support.

I would just add, if I may, that the Premier has said, "I've always believed this is a non-partisan issue," and I

realize, listening to you yesterday, you said this is a non-partisan group. It is sometimes very difficult, but I think non-partisan policies now are absolutely essential for the good of the country.

The Chair: We certainly recognize the importance of that last point. I think we have been working very hard as a committee and will continue to work hard to try to come up with, as much as we can, a consensus position in the kind of directions we are going towards. I think that is really important.

Mr Jones: As I said, this is a little town. We are 6,200 people. We are not large, but we are fortunate to be surrounded by a forest, and we have excellent people. One of the things the council has is a sense of urgency, and this poster which I hold up—I do not know where the TV people are—says CPR general manager Van Horne's work ethic, "If you want something done, name the day when it must be finished." That is what we try to instil in our town staff and employees, in so far as the town of Dryden is concerned. This committee has the day it must report to Queen's Park, and we appreciate that.

We are honoured that you have come here. We have given you council's opinion. Other people will be giving you theirs, including myself. I just want to close this brief opening of welcome by telling you that we are not running out of trees; we have a viable industry. I invite you all to come back to this place. I realize, when I extend that invitation, that many of you have not been here before, that your committee is heavily weighted to the south. I recognize the members for Cochrane South and Parry Sound, but, really, we do not count you people as the north, but you are. We invite you to come back and see this place in the summertime, if you can, when you can travel our forests and see for yourselves what we are talking about. We will welcome you back.

Welcome this morning and thank you very much for this time to make this little presentation.

1000

The Chair: There may be some questions from the committee, and I want to give them an opportunity. Ms Churley, go ahead.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your welcome. I just want to tell you that originally I came from Labrador, which is, as you know, very far to the north. I keep bragging about that.

Although we are trying very hard and we are doing a good job of being non-partisan here, I must comment on your choice of colours. We were very gratified this morning to come in and find not only orange, but a little green on there. We think you have made a very good choice and the folks across the way, I think, look very good in orange.

Mr Jones: We would like to give those little ribbons out to visitors. My advice is that you can attach it to your expense account to prove you were in Dryden.

Mr Harnick: I was interested in your fifth point dealing with bilingualism. I wonder if you can enlighten the committee about the discussion around your table when you had to work out that final point. What were some of the concerns people had?

Ms Wells: Perhaps I could make it a personal observation as opposed to a council observation.

There are discrepancies in Dryden about bilingualism across the country. Personally, I can speak French. I learned it at school, and I think that is the way it has to go. I think legislating French now to people is not the way to go. I do not object to bilingualism as such across the country except I do not think you can legislate it; it causes too many problems now among people who are grown up, shall we say. It is costly and, frankly, it is boring. For me as a municipal councillor and interested in politics, for instance, it is extremely boring to sit and listen to something like this repeated in French twice. One loses one's concentration, it is time-consuming and, consequently, more costly. Those are the simple facts, without objecting to bilingualism as a way of this country. As to whether it is really necessary, in my heart I think it is not necessary, and I think common sense could prevail here with French Canadians and English Canadians as well.

Mr Jones: May I add that we have had the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada come to our council chamber several times in the last two or three years with lists of people who have signed petitions for APEC. We have passed those to the proper authorities, the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Ontario. Our council has not taken a stand on this matter, but it has been exposed to it and knows the two sides of the story. It is not something we are just saying. We think bilingualism and multicultural policies should be reviewed as of today.

JOHN PARRY

The Chair: We will proceed with our list of presenters and call John Parry.

Mr Parry: I am very glad to have the opportunity to be with you this morning. I must apologize that I have not given you a printed copy of my brief nor the biographical detail sheet I had wanted to present. I finished it last night, but when I came to print it out this morning, unfortunately my computer told me there was no printer attached. I could not convince the dumb machine that it was sitting right on the table. I hope to solve that glitch while watching the rest of this session on television and try to get it to you before you depart for Sioux Lookout.

I represent only myself. For those of you who do not know me, very briefly, I was mayor of Sioux Lookout for six years, I was member of Parliament for the NDP for four years. I am currently unemployed and have most recently worked producing training manuals and videos for the local paper mill.

Il me fait grand plaisir de voir votre comité siégeant à Dryden et de voir la diversité et la richesse culturelle de notre grande province si bien représentée dans votre participation.

I can appreciate the difficulties you labour under, as a former member and chair of parliamentary committees. I am sure you have already been berated for an unrealistic schedule, the lateness of the background paper—I got mine yesterday—the near total lack of advance publicity. I would add one more thing: please stick to your mandate. Of course we are all concerned about the Gulf war and

about many other things, but your mandate is the Constitution, and I feel it is a very heavy one. I thought yesterday illustrated how Canadians sometimes tend to be too tolerant. It is difficult, of course, to concentrate on the Constitution when our country is at war, a war that many like myself felt premature, perhaps unnecessary, but which now has to be pursued and prosecuted effectively. But we can all celebrate with gratitude the idealism, the dedication and commitment of our forerunners that gives us this freedom to discuss rather than earning us a one-way trip to the dungeons or the torture chambers of a murderous tyrant. Truly we are blessed.

As a new Canadian, now of over 20 years' standing, I could easily wax lyrical over the strengths and the glories of this Canada and over my own commitment, but time does not permit. I see my responsibility as offering you a few original ideas I may have and my opinions on the most significant of other ideas. In preparing my notes, I realized I could not possibly cram everything in. I will try to include all the detail in my answers. Some observations, then.

First, Canada's constitutional history is a terrible sequence, a mishmash: a written Constitution produced by bodies and individuals that had no tradition, taste or training for constitutions of the written variety and who therefore produced a succession of unworkable documents which they, in considerable degree, ignored themselves. Tradition and precedent quickly overlaid the written word, which is packed with exceptions, contradictions and inconsistencies. If anyone here understands this, they are a better brain than I, truly. Until repatriation in 1982, tradition arguably held greater sway. For example, the Senate, by tradition, never rejected a government bill duly passed by the Commons.

What we really have in Canada is not one but three constitutions, with two of them opposing each other directly in this document, and one, which is arguably the most influential, trying to get back into the equation. We have the constitution of governments, we have the constitution of individuals and processes and we have the constitution of tradition.

The early Constitution Acts, 1867 up until 1982, essentially established the rights of governments and the relationships between governments. In 1982 was introduced the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and sparked a shift to the courts against tradition and a swing away from governments to processes. Tradition was arguably the most influential constitution until 1982 when it was almost evicted. As a result, I feel it is a miracle that Canada has survived this far.

Canada seems to be like a teenager, continually outgrowing its clothes, stretching for maturity but constantly held back by reminders of its youth. Our constitutional clothing was designed for infancy, not adolescence or adulthood, and their style and size reflect the past, not the future, as they should. We do not have a Constitution we can grow into, and that is what we need.

1010

If I can draw on my wife's cultural heritage, the Chinese character for "crisis" is composed of two characters,

one representing danger and one opportunity. Our challenge, your challenge is to avoid one and grasp the other and of course know which is which.

Why is our Canadian identity such a problem? Since I came to this country I have never had difficulty distinguishing Canadians from Americans. Why do we call for a strong central government? Do we want all that power in Ottawa? Do we act as if we want it? What we really need is a strong central identity as Canadians, built around shared values, built around democracy, equity, due process, tolerance, caring for others, lawfulness, reasonableness, gradualism and shared values. That would be more important than any institution we have or could develop.

Part of our identity problem is disagreement over what a country or a nation should be and what Canada specifically should be. The 1867 act states that we will be federally united into one dominion under the name of Canada. "Dominion" of course comes from the first chapter of Genesis, verse 26, where man, the human species, is granted dominion over the other creations of God. It is defined in the Concise Oxford Dictionary as "lordship, sovereignty, control."

So we have this federal union latterly presented as a Confederation, but in some minds a nation. I feel that Canada has long been a country, but has never been one nation. Lord Durham referred to us as two nations warring in the bosom of a single state and lately we realize that two nations is insulting and exclusive of the aboriginal people, whose use of the rhetorical term "first nations" very neatly reminds us of this. We do violence to ourselves and we insult and exclude others if we strive for the one-nation or even the two-nation concept. Nothing is better guaranteed to break Canada up than to try to import a relatively new European concept only 300 or 400 years old with a very bloody track record that is showing clear signs of losing ground in Europe itself.

Our psychology of Constitution-making is wrong. We must see all Canadians as reflections, even as parts of ourselves. The self-government first ministers' conference has failed because some saw our aboriginal people as "the other." Meech Lake was signed because the province, as Jim Sinclair, the Metis leader from Saskatchewan, predicted, saw Quebec as "one of us" but then it failed because too many Canadians saw Quebec as "the other" and too many Canadians in Quebec saw the rest of Canada as "the other" also.

The Meech Lake failure: I am reminded of an Italian cartoon strip, Mafalda. I will read it in French.

Mafalda est une jeune fille très précoce, très intelligente, qui demande toutes les questions que les jeunes filles doivent demander mais en réalité ne demandent jamais. Elle a vu des gens faire un creux dans la rue, des ouvriers. Elle leur demande :

«Alors, que faites-vous messieurs? Est-ce que vous cherchez les racines nationales?»

«Non, c'est une fuite de gaz.»

«Ah! typique. On sacrifie toujours l'important à l'urgent.»

It was because the important was sacrificed to the urgent that we had the Meech Lake process. I voted for

Meech Lake. I thought of that dictum of von Clausewitz, that politics is the art of the possible. I was reassured by a research paper from the library of Parliament, that treaty rights were not affected, and convinced by my colleague Lynn McDonald that the Senate had already been entrenched and therefore could not be abolished through Meech Lake. Party discipline has something to do with this too. I felt it was the best possible solution at the time, but it was a hasty solution and I think ultimately the people of Canada were right in rejecting it. I do not believe that settling for the best possible is any longer good enough and I think that Canadians demand the best that can be reached rather than the best that can be reached under existing arrangements.

I did not feel that the Meech Lake agreement rejection was a rejection of Quebec, although Quebec must realize that it alienated many of its friends in the rest of Canada by its support of the free trade agreement.

Economic arguments: I suggest you do not pay too much attention to these.

Bilingualism: Even if it were to cost as much as 1% of the gross national product, it would be cheap if it worked to keep the country together. If it only divides us, it would of course be expensive at far less.

Trade: Trade patterns, as the background paper shows, will continue to develop, whatever our constitutional arrangements. Even extensive constitutional change would not drastically disrupt our economy. We are still a resource-rich country located closer than any other to the richest market in the world. Morale is the key factor in what makes an economy go, whether we are happier and/or more challenged. We will work harder and we will prosper better. Look at the success stories within our country such as la région de la Beauce, such as Steinbach, or in my own area, Emo.

My recommendations:

1. We should abolish the Senate. This obscene institution, an antidemocratic body implanted like a cancer at the very heart of our democratic institutions, has no parallel in any western democracy. It destroys accountability, destroys responsibility in government. It is a patronage trough and a sewer and it has been essentially replaced in any function that it ever had by the first ministers' conference. Remember that since Meech has been rejected, now we can go back to the 1982 formula which does not require unanimity to abolish the Senate.

2. We have to rapidly eliminate barriers to interprovincial trade. If there is no change, they will be worse in 1996 than the barriers between the United States and Canada. They are the silent killers of the Canadian identity.

3. We have to have one more try at an executive-federalism solution to include Quebec, that is, federal and provincial first ministers' conferences to reach an accommodation but with extensive public input to avoid another Meech Lake debacle. If this fails, then we have to have a new process.

4. We have to incorporate aboriginal self-government into the Constitution. We have to have a new round of talks like the 1986 and 1987 talks. Quebec must be included and these talks must go parallel to the inclusion of

Quebec talks and under the same structure with of course the addition of aboriginal representatives. We have to concentrate on constitutionalizing a framework within which the details of self-government can be laid down for the individual first nations communities.

5. We should have a royal commission on reducing waste and duplication by governments in Canada.

6. We should entrench the recognition of constitutional tradition as an authority equal to the written authority.

7. We have to study the establishment of a tribunal of the Constitution, replacing constitutional functions of the Supreme Court. It is ridiculous that a single profession should have a monopoly on the rulings of interpretations of the Constitution.

8. We have to entrench the right to municipal government in Canada. This does not exist. It is something granted by the provinces. That is an insult to us as everyday citizens.

9. Because of the growing threat of our deficit, which itself could tear Canada apart, we have to eliminate all government-to-government transfer payments except those for health, social programs and education, where our common interests demand high standards across the country.

10. Following my fifth and ninth recommendations, governments that are presently too small to be viable without excessive subsidies should begin and should begin of their own free will amalgamation negotiations. I am glad we have had an indication from the Maritimes that this may be starting.

11. We should recodify our existing Constitution with any amendments. Presently it is totally impenetrable to the ordinary Canadian.

If I might just present a couple of ideas on an alternative process if the first ministers' conference fails; we have to have a constitutional college elected on an equal-voice basis. They should be salaried for a two- or three-year term and disqualified from any other elected office for five years after so that they are not tempted to use the forum as a bandstand. They must accept public input individually as members of the constitutional college from citizens and they must form committees and panels to hear organizations. They must present a draft to the Canadian public and they must hear submissions from the federal government, from the provinces, from the territorial governments and aboriginal federations.

The proposed Constitution should be put to the people by a referendum, perhaps for adoption by a two-thirds or a three-quarter vote and should be put to the provinces for ratification. If neither the people of the province nor the provincial Legislature accepts the Constitution, then there should be another referendum to confirm or overturn the first decision. If a province, its Legislature and its people together reject a new Canadian Constitution, then there would be no alternative to beginning negotiations for separation. That concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer questions.

1020

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Parry. I know there is one question. I am not going to allow any more than that, I am afraid, though.

Mr Eves: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think it is an extremely thoughtful one. We will try to take your advice to stay focused, which is difficult from time to time. A few of the points you made are very well received, about interprovincial trade barriers, the aboriginal and native people and their inclusion in our constitutional process.

However, I would like to ask you a couple of questions about a couple of points you made. Right at the outset you said: "Do we need a strong central government at all? Perhaps what Canada needs is a strong central identity." I would like you to expand on that further, if you would. Perhaps in particular I suppose the province of Quebec, at least the governing party in Quebec, has most recently thought it has suggested just such a thing with its proposed transfer of power of 22 separate areas from the federal government to the provincial government. At least the provincial government, under its proposal, would have the jurisdiction for those areas.

The second point I would like you to touch, if you would not mind, is that about the Senate. A lot of people seem to have approached the Senate from the viewpoint of reforming it to an elected body as opposed to abolishing it. What reaction do you think abolition would have, for example, in western Canada or perhaps even the province of Quebec itself?

Mr Parry: First, the Allaire report, of which I have not seen a copy but I have read reports, goes too far. It would weaken the Canadian federal government too much. There are some things in the Allaire report that could be granted to the province of Quebec and which could be granted to other provinces if they really wanted to exercise them and which in the long run would be good for all of Canada. I, for example, see no real reason why Quebec should not control immigration to Quebec provided of course that people still have freedom to move within Canada. In the 1867 act, immigration is specifically mentioned as a field in which the provinces do have powers.

Another thing would be agriculture, where the federal government could save a lot of money and a lot of trouble if it were not involved with the province of Quebec, if that is the wish of the province of Quebec. As far as the Senate is concerned, I suppose I have made myself abundantly clear as to where I stood. Of course one never presents one's backup position on the first rounds. If we cannot get the Senate abolished, then we have to get it reformed. I am a convinced and diehard unicameralist, meaning just one House. Our municipal governments have one house. Our provincial governments have one House. Those that had senates have sensibly abolished them; the Legislative Council, as it was referred to in Quebec.

We have examples of federal states, I believe, with one House. I am trying to think of them. I think New Zealand is the example that I have heard of. I am not quite sure of the federal character. My belief is that our municipal gov-

ernments and our provincial governments function far more efficiently and effectively than our federal government. Every function that the Senate was originally endowed with is now being more effectively fulfilled by the first ministers' conference.

The Chair: Thank you. I know there are other questions but I think we have to move on. I just want to remind people again, I should have probably mentioned this before, that our timelines are such that we were able to allocate a space of only about 15 minutes for each individual presenting. We would like to also, if possible, within that time have an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr F. Wilson: Mr Chairman, may I ask Mr Parry one thing on his written presentation?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr F. Wilson: Mr Parry, if you would, you have given us a good view of what you would like to see for your constitutional college arrangement. When you are putting your presentation together and you put your views down for your constitutional college, you make reference to your other alternative of the first ministers' meetings you were mentioning. I wonder what you would envision. It seems cumbersome to me. I would like to see it in written form, if you would, please.

Mr Parry: Yes. It is all in the computer.

The Chair: We will look forward to getting the written presentation.

TOMMY S. JONES

The Chair: I call now Tommy Jones.

Mr Jones: I am a Canadian. My father was Welsh, my mother English. I was schooled in Fort William and I am an undergraduate in the school of hard knocks. I spent four years overseas, including six months with the Fusiliers de Montréal, a French Canadian regiment, and in that six-month immersion with that regiment and my high school French, I could patter with anybody. I was wounded in action in France.

My business experience includes visits to Quebec City 10 to 12 times a year for over 16 years. I have been mayor of Dryden for 10 years with a holiday of three years, and this is my last year of service. I have no axe to grind. Nobody voted for me in the first place and nobody is going to vote for me in the last place. I am just here to give my own personal opinions and they are controversial, but that is what you want. We want to hear everybody. Now, 15 minutes.

I believe Canada is the finest and the best country in the world. Our Premier, Bob Rae, has stated the following: "Canada is not negotiable. Ontario does not for a moment accept the proposition that the federal government speaks for English Canada. There will be no closed-door deals on the Constitution. We have built so much here. Let's focus on the positive. Let's focus on the constructive way." That is Bob Rae.

I believe the majority of Canadians, including many Quebecers, have benefited and will continue to benefit from a united country. Agreement between the federal government and the provinces and the territories should

apply to all provinces and the territories, with no separate agreement with any province; one for all and all for one.

Weakening of federal responsibilities and leadership is too high a price to pay for satisfying Quebec or any province. Much support for radical and regional political parties in English Canada has resulted from Pierre Trudeau's bilingual and multicultural policies. The official bilingual policy, which was approved by the three political parties, has not worked.

I view with great concern the millions or billions of tax dollars spent on multiculturalism and bilingualism. One example are the signs across Canada on all government property that say "Arrêt." Well, I go to France once in a while. What do the signs say? Simply, in international language, "Stop." Get the point?

Quebec itself does not favour or follow the policy. In the other provinces, while provincial governments have added provincial legislation and force to the policy they have not been readily accepted by a majority of the population. They have been forced on the provinces, and to be cynical, I believe we started to get votes and all political parties were concerned that if they did not agree they would lose votes.

I believe where there are large numbers of French Canadians in Ontario communities they should be serviced in the French language if requested by those municipalities. The French-language requirements of the Ontario government are of great concern to many civil servants and do affect morale.

1030

The educational system has had to assume the cost of French immersion classes, which are borne by all taxpayers. I have suggested for years—I am a voice crying in the wilderness—that Canada and the provinces should install French-language education for all students, not just for a few. We would not have many of the problems today if that policy, which was in effect in Ontario in my day, had not been taken over by permissive choices.

The legal and moral responsibilities for all aboriginal people lie with the federal government. Yes, the provinces have responsibilities too. I believe most citizens want the aboriginal land claims settled amicably. There are many of us Ontario northerners who, to paraphrase Premier Bob Rae, do not for one moment accept the proposition that the federal or provincial government should speak for northerners in negotiations without northerners being represented at the bargaining session. We live, work and play in this north and believe we have our rights to be considered. Such negotiations with the inclusion of northern taxpaying residents will be acceptable when decisions are made much better than if they are not present. The objective should be to have our aboriginal people become citizens of this great country, contributing and benefiting from our many blessings.

Governments, except municipal, do not have to balance budgets and cannot go broke. Canada is almost broke with a high interest payment on borrowed money. Quebec is also almost broke as a have-not province receiving billions of dollars in grants. Ontario, according to a Globe and Mail report, is hardest hit by the recession and "drag-

ging the nation down." With this economic outfit, I do not think Quebec will separate, but if it does, it will soon be broke.

"No more closed doors," says Premier Bob. Let's have constitutional proposals decided by a referendum requiring a majority across the nation and in more than half the provinces individually.

The Senate could serve a better purpose. Northwestern Ontario used to have two Senate seats, one in Thunder Bay and east and one west of Thunder Bay to the Manitoba boundary. These seats became vacant by death and were not filled by northwestern Ontarians. We believe that these two appointments, election or whatever you want, should be returned to the people of northwestern Ontario. I believe this would help make the Senate more valuable to us, situated as we are in the centre of Canada and larger than several provinces. The addition of a couple of northwesterners could contribute much to sanity in the Senate.

Time does not permit me to go on with other thoughts, but if you wish these, I would be pleased to sit down again and discuss points. I write a weekly column for the local Dryden Observer and I am going to pass out several of my columns that have given opinions—and they are mine—on bilingualism and multiculturalism. They make good reading on these long trips that you have between towns in northwestern Ontario.

In addition, I have included a column on forestry in northwestern Ontario, which I recommend you read. It is our basic economy issue here. This area is not running out of trees and our regeneration, both natural and artificial, is evident. A visit to these areas by a parliamentary committee and by yourselves as individuals, as per the invitation by the mayor, would prove that my statement is correct for this area of the country.

A few minutes ago, an individual said to me, "I would like to say something to this committee," and then she gave me the devil. I said, "Say it to them yourself." Sybil Willard, will you please stand up and say your piece?

Ms Willard: First of all, as an ex-schoolteacher, I am going to take you all to task for being almost half an hour late starting this meeting. That is the first black mark.

The second is your lack of advertisement. I found out that somebody was coming to this place because the retired teachers had to change their meeting. I was curious and somebody said, "It is the Keith Spicer commission," so I got busy and phoned both newspapers and the radio saying, "Did you know that the Spicer commission is coming to Dryden on 5 February?" Nobody had heard anything.

Somebody told me to get in touch with Brian England and he assured me it was not the Spicer commission, but your particular commission from the Ontario government. Then I had to phone around and apologize to everyone for misinforming them. But what advertisement did you get? You got a little column about so big in the Dryden Observer and there was nothing in the Local Express. As I do not listen to our local news radio station because of the awful music it plays, I did not hear any of that, so I think you have done yourselves ill.

You have got a number of retired teachers here and you have got a number that belong to the study group that I join in on Tuesdays, but they would probably not have been here if it had not been that we had to change our meetings and come. I think with all the money that has been spent to send you up here, you should have spent a little time in advertising. Who can get ready a brief when the paper came out last Wednesday?

But you have had some awfully good briefs and I want to compliment that man in Kenora, Andrew somebody or another. I thought he was marvellous and I agreed with everything he said. I listened, I tried to find you last night, but you were on 11 and I went back to 27 and you were not on 27 then, so I missed you last night, but I thoroughly enjoyed the proceedings at Kenora. Thank you. Thank you, Mr Jones.

Mr Jones: There you have it from the grass roots.

The Chair: Mr Jones, if you would like to wait, I think there are a couple of questions. We do have a little bit of time left. Thank you for the clippings. I do want to say that with respect to the process, again I apologize for this morning. Our starting time was actually scheduled at 10 o'clock. I gather that maybe it was announced as 9:30, so there was a bit of confusion about that.

Second, as far as the advertisings are concerned, there were supposed to have been, in our understanding, some advertisements in the local media. Again, that is something we will take a look at. I hope there were and we will see what we need to do in other communities to improve that, if that is something that needs improvement.

Mr Miclash: Thank you very much your presentation, Tommy, and your addition, Sybil, was great.

Tommy, you talked about aboriginal negotiations with the first nations and you talked about the involvement of citizens in those negotiations. Now we know the most recent negotiations to affect this area were negotiations on the Indian fishing agreement. Could you expand a bit on how you see the individual citizens fitting into that process?

Mr Jones: This is our local MPP, Mr Miclash. He raises a sore point. In several of the communities in northwestern Ontario some of us worked for a long time, prepared briefs, and there were hundreds of people out at a meeting in Dryden on the Indian fishing rights. The report was issued to the government. It was the previous government, I admit, but that report is still there and we have heard nothing back. The chairman of the committee happens to be from Dryden. He has had no communication back after he put his report in.

It would take hours to talk about the Indian fishing agreements. The only point is that the government is an arbitrator in this matter, the government has the final say. They are going to negotiate with the native peoples, and I do not object to that, but I think it would be much better if the government would also appoint a representative group of northern residents to sit there. When decisions are made and come out, they will be accepted much better than they will from the arbitrator and the appealing party making a decision. Is that enough?

Mr Miclash: Thank you very much.

1040

Mr Jones: Anybody else? Time is precious.

Mr Bisson: I would like, first of all, to point out that I am the other member from northern Ontario. I am from Timmins, so I am a northerner myself. Just so that you know, we have been having a lot of discussions on the plane and on the bus on the way up in regard to forestry issues, because I understand what you are saying.

It brings me to the point that I have a bit of a hard time trying to understand part of what you were saying, because on the one hand you are advocating that a place like northern Ontario needs to have special representation in the Senate. It needs to be recognized because it is different. Because it is different, you need to have people there to be able to represent the views of northern Ontario.

I agree with you that often what happens in this country, I think, as part of the problem is that process by which people from parts within the country that are different do not sometimes have adequate voice in being able to express what some of the problems are. You explained the problems with forestry and some of the misunderstandings on the part of some of our own citizens in this province when it comes to the whole question of forestry, when it comes to the question of aboriginal rights or whatever.

Where I have a hard time is that you agree that when you are distinct in some sense, you need to have special representation. But somehow that does not carry over to Quebec. I am just wondering if you can explain to me the difference in that philosophy.

Mr Jones: First of all, you did not understand me, and I am sorry. Now I just do not understand your question. Would you repeat it for me so that I know?

Mr Bisson: What I am saying is that I agree with what you are saying in principle. What you are saying is that as a northerner, you feel you need to have special representation when it comes to getting some of us as politicians and people—you spoke about the Senate, for example—to represent the views of northern Ontario, because our issues here in the north are different. There is no question about that.

But when you started off your presentation to this committee, you said that what we need to have are laws that are basically the same across the province. Everybody has to be treated in the same vein. That is where I have a hard time, because you are saying where the north needs to have some sort of different understanding or some sort of different process to get our issues understood, it does not carry over to Quebec. I am just wondering if you can explain that.

Mr Jones: First of all, I say northerners because you are here and this is what I am promoting. I realize there are large Indian reserves, for instance, in southern Ontario. I am not suggesting how that be made up. I leave that up to the government. I have some trust in the government. I really do. If it would appoint a representative group so the public would then see who it is appointing and know that it is not favouring any party or whatever, I think people will accept the result better. That is all I am saying.

Mr Bisson: I tend to agree—

The Chair: I am sorry, Mr Bisson. We are going to have to move on. Thank you.

DRYDEN DISTRICT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The Chair: I call Joanne Misner, first vice-president of the chamber of commerce.

Ms Misner: Good morning, Mr Chairman, select committee members, ladies and gentlemen.

I would like to take a moment to welcome Gary in sign language. I just wanted to say welcome to Dryden.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much.

Ms Misner: I would like to take the opportunity to thank the select committee on Ontario in Confederation for allowing us to speak on the many political and economical issues facing Ontario and the country of Canada today.

Unfortunately, we were not able to hold an executive or a general meeting of the Dryden District Chamber of Commerce prior to this presentation. Like everybody else, I got notified last Wednesday, so I am not able to bring the views of the current executive or the membership before you today. I would like to state that the chamber keeps up to date on the efforts of our Premier, Bob Rae, and wishes the select committee all the best in its endeavours with this massive project with such a short deadline.

I have been asked to bring the personal observations of our president, Mark Boudreau, to your attention and again state that they are his personal comments and may not reflect the views of the chamber body. His comments are based on only one topic of discussion for today, and that is the issue of Quebec's future. This is from Mark:

A strong federal government overseeing the nation's interests in matters that affect all Canadians has been part of the mandate of the federal government since Confederation. This system, while not perfect, has performed reasonably well. Canada is the envy of the world for the standard of living, quality of life and protection of the less fortunate that we provide.

Since the majority of the Canadian population receives its information from the media, it is difficult to determine exactly what the average person in Quebec is lacking. The prosperity that Quebec currently enjoys has been developed in a federalist system. If the majority of the Quebec population, by way of a referendum, feels that the current status quo is unacceptable and that Quebec should be given special privileges not shared by other provinces, then we should actively negotiate its departure.

The arrogance of threatening the breakup of Canada if Quebec does not get its own way is nothing short of blackmail. Quebec is constantly reminding us of its ability to survive and prosper as an independent state. It should not come as a surprise that the remaining provinces will survive and prosper without Quebec. It is not our preference to see a breakup of Canada. It must be very clear to Quebec that the remaining provinces all seek a solution to their problems but are not afraid of the consequences. This is not a counterthreat; only the reality.

After a thorough analysis of the facts, not just emotional hype, if the majority of the Quebec population does

not wish to remain within the Dominion of Canada, so be it. I do not believe we should bow to our knees to keep Quebec in the family at the expense of the remaining partners.

I do not believe sovereignty-association should be an option for discussion. It suggests they seek the independence of statehood without the risks that are so associated. A negotiated settlement of assets and liabilities on a per capita basis should be concluded. No common currency, no common defence, no common customs and excise: either you are in with modifications that are fair to all partners or you are out.

I believe this style of demands and threats using Canada as hostage is repulsive. This issue must be settled once and for all. Dragging this issue from one decade to the next is an anchor around the neck of the country which we do not need.

The Chair: I do not know if you are comfortable answering questions, given that you are reading out somebody else's position, but if you are prepared to answer some questions if there are any, I will entertain them. Are there any questions? No? I see none.

Actually, I do have one. It may again be something that you may not be able to answer, given your opening comments. I wonder, as somebody who is involved in the chamber of commerce, whether you have any comments on any of the questions dealing with the economics that are raised in the discussion paper.

Ms Misner: Actually, unfortunately the chamber has not met on this issue at the moment. We have had a brief discussion basically regarding what the outcome of separatism would mean. It is going to cause a conflict in the markets that are already presently established. In a way we look at the benefits as well. Without the bilingualism issue, there will be millions of dollars saved on promotions, advertising, labelling, a lot of different things.

I think we are looking at it that if Quebec does decide to stay within the Dominion of Canada, then the issues of bilingualism will have to be renegotiated. However, if they do decide they want out, then let them out, but do not let them have any common operating power with Ontario or with the other provinces.

The Chair: I was also just asking the question aside from the issues of Quebec being in or outside of Canada. I just invite you, if over the next few weeks the chamber has an opportunity to discuss these things and if you are able to come up with a position, to please feel free to forward that to us.

Ms Misner: Yes, the chamber is meeting on the 12th. We will be discussing it.

Mr Offer: Certainly I think your last comment was the first observation that I was going to make. After your chamber has gone through what might be some of the economic ramifications in this particular district, I think it would very helpful for us as committee members to get some sense as to how you see the ramifications of a different Confederation, certainly in this district.

My question deals with any thoughts that you might have as to what Ontario's role should be in the negotiation.

Currently there is an emerging process, certainly with Quebec and the federal government, dealing with a number of items which Quebec has at first instance put on the table. They are not yet formally adopted, but they are there and it seems to be an emerging focus.

Is this a situation where it is a take it or leave it? From your perspective, does Ontario have a role to play in saying, "Let's see what can be accommodated, if not for Quebec and Ontario, for all other provinces"? Is there a role that you feel Ontario can and should play in these negotiations?

1050

Ms Misner: That is hard to come up with on the spur of the moment. Yes, I think it has definitely got to be a negotiating process, with Ontario being probably the largest neighbour, being the strongest power in those negotiations. I read your discussion paper—we just got it last night—stating that Ontario basically has the most to lose because of our trading agreements as well as the amount of market percentage that goes back and forth with Quebec. They are our largest partner that we trade exports—well, not really exports, but out-of-provincial markets with.

Basically my view would be that we could not do it as a take it or leave it. I do state that if they do want to become their own sovereignty, definitely no common courtesy and they should be treated the same as the United States. We may have a free trade agreement with them or the same customs and excise agreements, but I do not think we should give them the option of having their own government and still working under the same benefits that Canada now provides them. I think it is going to work out to be a take it or leave it with other agreements in place, unfortunately.

Mr Offer: Just as a final observation, if after you have gone through the economic impact that a different type of Confederation may bring, certainly in the particular discussion paper there are other aspects that we are going to be grappling with and I would hope that maybe the chamber in this district would not just focus in on the economic ramifications, important as they are, but also some of the other questions for discussion which have been posed. I think it would be very helpful for the committee.

Ms Misner: Sure, we will work on that.

Ms Harrington: I think you may have noticed that in our discussion paper the first question we asked was, "What are the values we share as Canadians?" That is a good place to start this whole thinking process and looking towards the future.

Yesterday we heard various answers, such as what we share is a tradition of, say, honesty and a peace-loving and caring type of approach, especially from the first nations people. I would like to ask you and maybe the people you are talking with or representing what values you think we share as a nation. What is important to us? What is Canada?

Ms Misner: Oh, we have talked about a lot of things. Basically we are proud of the fact that Canada—like we opened up with—has one of the highest standards of living. There are definitely problems, but it is something that

is respected by a lot of countries. I also am very proud of our health care services, although we know that area is coming under a lot of scrutiny lately. Our educational services are also something to be proud of and we value that. We definitely have a problem with the language issue, but I do think that is also negotiable. If we lose Quebec, it may not be an issue any more. Basically, as you said, we value the integrity and the honesty of the country, but it is something also that would have to go into discussion before I could relate any more.

Ms Churley: You actually finished off your last statement with a statement that you mentioned before, which is startling to me, and that is, it must be very scary to francophones who do not live in Quebec to be hearing that if Quebec were to leave, language would not be an issue. I just wanted to have you clarify that for me. I am sure you are speaking only for yourself here. Are you saying that if it turns out that Quebec is no longer part of the Confederation of Canada, you would see not preserving the rights of francophones in the rest of Ontario and making sure that they have the right to their own language and their own culture?

Ms Misner: No, I am sorry about the way I said that. I would still recognize that French is an important part of Canada whether we have Quebec or not. I just think—this is hard to say—I do not know whether bilingualism would still have a majority vote if Quebec was not backing it. I support French by all means. I do know, though, the economic costs involved if you legislate bilingualism across Canada. The costs are horrendous in marketing, promotions, packaging, everything. I do know that a lot of the large companies in Canada would actually favour the loss of the bilingualism legislation. Basically, no, I think it is still going to be something that will be negotiated no matter what happens with Quebec.

ANDREW McFAYDEN

Mr. McFayden: Good morning. I am here representing, in theory, Dryden High School when in fact I only interviewed 10 students for my presentation, as well as my own opinions. I am a Canadian. Every time I say that I am filled with immense pride. I guess I realized my feelings about three years ago when I was on a tour of Europe with my family. The incident that I am talking about occurred in the beautiful city of Verona, Italy.

I was standing outside a small sidewalk café in the main square when I was approached by what appeared to be a local middle-aged man. He said to me, "Americano?" as if he expected me to be an American, seeing as I was a tourist. I said "No, I am a Canadiano." As soon as I said that his face lit up, he had a big smile on his face and he started to jabber to me in Italian although I could not understand a word he said.

After a few minutes he asked me where I was from in Canada. I said I was from Dryden, Ontario, which is near Winnipeg, thinking he probably knew Winnipeg. Unfortunately, he never had a chance to respond because somebody was calling him from across the square so we never even got a chance to go on with the conversation. It was

just then I think I realized how much I loved and was proud of my country.

As I said, for my presentation I interviewed 10 people from my school. The first question I asked them was: "What is your opinion on Confederation? How do you think it may be improved, if at all?" The most popular opinion that was given to me was that every province must be equal, that Quebec should not have any special powers and that a new deal must include the entire country as its central purpose, not only Quebec. Some other opinions that I had given to me were that ties between provinces should be stronger, that Quebec should have spoken up many years ago if it wanted to separate and that Ontario should put forward these points in any future talks in order to achieve a better and a more acceptable Canada for everyone.

I also posed the question, "What do you think Ontario's role is in Confederation today?" The people I interviewed unanimously agreed that Ontario is the power broker, is the industrial and the virtual economic centre of Canada and is unquestionably the population centre of the country. As a follow-up to that, I asked if we should keep that role as the power broker. Most people said no, because each province should not be treated differently because of its status, its wealth, its economic standing or stability.

Another question I proposed was whether or not they agreed with the present systems of government in both Toronto and in Ottawa. A few people said that nor'westers were being ignored by both governments. However, the majority said that our system is one of the best in the world, that it is even better than the United States. However, one person also told me that the Senate is nothing but an expensive rubber stamp and should be abolished, but again, on another point that was brought up, everyone unanimously agreed that representation by population should remain.

1100

Now, according to me—this is my own opinion—Confederation is vital to the survival of our country and for the individual provinces. Every province must be equal and must answer to the Charter of Rights directly, without any question. What I mean is the "notwithstanding" clause; I would like to see that either stricken or have some kind of limit put on it so that our democracy would not be put in any kind of jeopardy.

There must be a strong, central government because that would help to keep the country together for the future of our people. I also echo points from my interviews. I favour a strong Ontario, but each province must be equal with more of an equal say in our government.

In conclusion, I love my country. People I interviewed also showed tremendous love for Canada as well. But there is one thing I noticed when I was interviewing. I tried to interview some other people, but they could not give me opinions and they are not included as part of the 11 people. The reason they did not is because they did not know anything about our system, the Canadian system, or the provincial and municipal system or what have you. They did not know anything about that. They did not know about the history behind the situation our country is in

right now, the history behind our system, and some people did not even really care.

The first thing to do in order to run a successful country is to overcome these obstacles and make the people aware. The Fathers of Confederation did not really trust democracy, as I understand it, so they established our Senate along the lines of the honourable House of Lords in Britain. But with the recent success of democracy, is it not time to alter the Senate to make it more responsible to the people? That is the triple E Senate, the equal, elected and effective Senate they have been talking about. They also made Ontario the virtual centre of Canada, but I say now, should every province not be equal in government matters?

Our Fathers of Confederation, I would imagine, have been turning in their graves over the past five years over the events because of Quebec threatening to separate and what have you, because they put a lot of time and a lot of effort into welding together our country, not to see it pulled apart.

Ontario knows it wants to be part of Canada; it has always known that. Ontario has always supported our national dream, which is the continental destiny, but is it not time to revive that dream of a harmonious nation with no racial, linguistic or cultural barriers instead of worrying about our national deficit? Ontario should again advocate these positions in future talks. I know the people that I interviewed would support that as well.

Some of you may not know this, but our national anthem is four verses and in closing I will leave you with a quote from the third verse. It says:

O, Canada,
beneath thy shining skies,
May stalwart sons
and gentle maidens rise,
To keep thee steadfast through the years
from east to western sea,
Our own beloved native land
our true north strong and free.

The Chair: Thank you, Andrew. You have sparked a lot of interest among the members of the committee. I am going to try to get through the list, but I do want to ask people to be very brief in their prefacing of their questions. That will help us get through.

Mr Eves: I want to thank you, Andrew, for appearing before the committee today. I think that obviously the purpose of the committee is not just the current generation in Canada, but the future generations are very important, if not more important.

I want to thank you for underscoring a few points, such as the education of our own people about our own history. Perhaps we could all serve Canada better by becoming more knowledgeable about the past and the present and hopefully leading to a better future in this country.

I note that you have said, as indeed many presenters have said in the last two days, you do not advocate a special status for the province of Quebec or for any province; I believe you said that.

Mr McFayden: No, I do not advocate a special position for Quebec.

Mr Eves: Okay. If in fact the reality ends up being that either Quebec is recognized as a distinct society or whatever wording you choose to put on that terminology, or it leaves the country, I suppose the question I have for you is, are you willing to negotiate that or not?

Mr McFayden: I cannot speak for the people I interviewed, but I personally would not like to see Quebec leave our country. It is a vital part of our country; however, in order to run a good nation, a successful nation, in the world community it should have every province, every portion of our country equal, not having any special powers to opt out of our Constitution or anything, because that would just jeopardize our democracy.

Mr Eves: I appreciate your point about the "notwithstanding" clause, but I do not know if many Canadians actually appreciate the fact that the "notwithstanding" clause was not just originated in the province of Quebec. In fact it was demanded by many western premiers as well.

Mr McFayden: Saskatchewan was the first to use it.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I want to thank you. You are the first student who has appeared before the committee and I hope this is a sign of things to come. I think it is important as Ontarians and as Canadians to listen to what our younger generation is saying, because at the end of the day you are the people who will be taking over when we are long gone, and hopefully you will do a better job of it.

You said you travelled to Italy some time ago and there was a big distinction to the person you were talking to in regard to his seeing you as a Canadian versus an American. Without getting into nationalistic things, I am just wondering what brought him to that conclusion.

Mr McFayden: The fact that I was a tourist?

Mr Bisson: No, the fact that he was seeing you as a Canadian as being different. You alluded, when you were talking, that he was seeing you as a Canadian and there was a difference in the way he treated you. I am just wondering if you can account for that, because I think that comes to the crux of what this is all about.

Mr McFayden: I am not quite sure. I guess, with recent events in mind, that Canada has always been regarded as, I suppose, a peace-keeping nation. I suppose that is probably why he regarded me as that, although I do not really know what he was thinking.

Mr Bisson: I guess what I would venture to think is that maybe, possibly what he sees within our nation, what other people see, is a tolerance—

Mr McFayden: Racial tolerance, yes.

Mr Bisson: —that we have been trying to purport and is something we keep in mind.

Mr McFayden: That is probably a reason, yes.

Mr Miclash: I too, Andrew, would like to welcome you as the first student to present to the committee and I hope that is, as Gilles has said, a sign of the future. I think

we have to hear from young people as the committee travels across this province.

Andrew, you mentioned a couple things, actually, that hit home with me. You mentioned the strengthening of ties between the provinces, and in doing that you mentioned our close connection to Winnipeg. Do you have any suggestions as to how those ties could be strengthened?

Mr McFayden: I have no idea, because that was a point that was given to me by one of the students I interviewed. I cannot really tell you how she thought on that point, but that is all I know.

Mr Miclash: How about yourself as a young person living in Dryden?

Mr McFayden: It is hard to say. Strengthening the federal government, I believe, would probably be the most effective way of doing it, instead of giving special powers to provinces or what have you, but I cannot speak for that student.

Mr Miclash: Great; thank you.

Ms Churley: I have to tell you that I had the same experience in Europe in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Americans we knew were running out buying maple leaves and putting them on their backpacks so they would be treated more nicely. So I think that realization that Canadians are special people has been around for a while.

I wanted to follow up on the previous question. Do you think it would be a good idea for governments to sponsor some kind of youth conference across the country? I would like to see Quebec youth, for instance, talking to Dryden youth, Ontario youth, and I sense you are very knowledgeable and some of your fellow students are. But I agree that most of the population, not just students, really do not understand a lot of what we are talking about here. I certainly had to catch up, and here I am a politician. I am wondering, if you heard each other's points of view as youth, got in a room together in some kind of conference, if that would be helpful.

Mr McFayden: It probably would be. Yes.

Ms Churley: Would you like to recommend that as something that—

Mr McFayden: Yes, I think that would be very beneficial.

1110

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Andrew, you have taken a real leadership role this morning, and I really want to commend you for that. You used very personal words about your values, like "love," "vital," "revival," and I am very happy that you have hopefulness in your heart. We asked you how you would build bridges and you seemed to go back to the statement that you think a strong central government can do that. Ms Churley asked you again about how students could be involved. I am wondering, have you personally been involved in an exchange program and can you tell me a little bit about what you see as a strong central government, the kinds of things that would be part of its authority or mandate or, I do not like the word "power," but in any case?

Mr McFayden: It is hard to say, really.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you partaken in an exchange program?

Mr McFayden: No, I have not. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to do that. I was thinking about it a few years ago but other matters just got in the way of that, so I could not partake in that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you got a few thoughts then on the strength of the central government and how you would like to see that happen?

Mr McFayden: Basically, it is just what I said before. It is hard to say. It is up for the rest of the people to decide, I believe.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Maybe you could think about that and discuss that further, because I think it would be very helpful to us, and if you do get some ideas, we would certainly like to hear from you. Thank you so much for coming.

Mr Harnick: Andrew, you can maybe help me out a little bit with an issue that we are finding to be a sensitive issue, and that is the French language and the availability of French-language services in Ontario and also the question of bilingualism in Canada in individual provinces. What discussions have you had with your friends at school on those issues? Is there any kind of consensus that you can see among your friends when talking about the language issue?

Mr McFayden: Some of my friends that I did interview have shown interest in French, but that is just speaking on observation in classroom, and some of them I do not know well enough to say that, but I myself am aiming for being bilingual one day. I am very interested in French. I believe it is very good that our country is bilingual, and that is pretty well all I have to say on that matter.

Mr Winner: I too would like to commend you, Andrew, on your moving and eloquent plea for unity and also for taking the initiative in not only presenting your brief today but consulting with your colleagues first at high school. If you were sitting in our seats and as a committee looking at future models for Confederation and you knew that Quebec may have separate social and economic aspirations, how would you deal with that?

Mr McFayden: I would take them into consideration, I believe. It is hard to say. I am not quite sure how I would deal with that.

Mr Winner: I know on the one hand, you want the strong sense of unity in Canada. But if I can use this analogy to a family and there are some members of the family who want to assert some independence and fulfil their own needs, how would you deal with that within the fabric of Confederation?

Mr McFayden: I would try to accommodate their needs but with the interest of the rest of the country in mind as well, because just putting your focus on one group, one province, one individual, whatever, only could make the rest of the country feel kind of alienated. I feel that is probably how the territories are feeling right now, and some of the western provinces.

Mr Winner: So it is not just Quebec that feels this sense of distinctiveness.

Mr McFayden: I do not think so.

The Chair: Okay. We will have to end there. Thank you very much, Andrew.

JEAN DAVIS

The Chair: I will call next, Jean Davis.

Ms Davis: Good morning, Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, members of the panel.

I am shocked to find myself sitting here before a committee trying to say how I think the government should conduct its business. I have lived in northern Ontario most of my life and I have travelled very little, but I have taken an active interest in my community and from that point of view I will speak on a few simple facts.

I feel privileged to speak here this morning. I belong to a small Bible study group of women who meet each Tuesday morning and we are unique in the fact that we do not belong to one denomination, so we have learned to search the scriptures for the truth and leave out our religious traditions from the discussions. The common welfare of all is important. Love, agape love, is truth and justice. Everyone is important and the balance must be found and then we go out into our community more responsible citizens.

We believe we need a strong federal government, but there is one important point: a strong, responsible federal government is the only thing that will put things back in balance.

From here on, I must say most of these comments are my own, because again, I did not know last Tuesday morning when we decided to come here that I was going to give this presentation. So from here on in, most of my thoughts are my own.

I have always believed for years that the Senate was there as a guardian to make sure that things were done properly, something like in our own community. If we need to draw up an agreement, we go to a good lawyer who can see not only if it will accomplish our needs now but how it will affect us in the future. There has been so much talk about changing the Senate and nothing seems to be done about it except adding more people, which puts us further in debt.

A strong government in a democratic society should lead by example. Force will never accomplish this. They are trying to convince us of the terrible debt problem, which none of us deny, but they spend millions pushing the GST through and then spend more money advertising why it is needed, plus buying votes by paying seniors and low-income people before it even goes into effect. It certainly is not the way to win my respect. We Canadians are not stupid and we are worried about what is happening to Canada, but I really feel that the governments have lost contact with people.

Again, I am going to keep it simple and use the example of a large family being raised with love—which again is justice—honesty and fair play for all. Then the federal government should set guidelines for the provinces, but strong guidelines, so that each one knows if it wants to stay in Confederation that these are the guidelines. Canada

is breaking apart trying to please everyone, and pleasing no one in the process.

Let us send a strong message back to Ottawa that we are Canadian and want to remain Canadian. It will only work, though, if Ottawa gives us guidelines we can be proud to follow. There has been so much waste at all levels of government, and I know we are a large country and it costs so much to travel and so on, but I believe it is time for governments to stop having commissions and feasibility studies and make use of the material that has already been gathered. Use the money to put people back to work who have lost their jobs.

We in Dryden have been in need of an extended care home for our elderly for years, and our hospital has needed upgrading for the same length of time. I wonder how much money has been spent on studies over the years while the crisis gets greater every year because we have an aging population. All levels of government have to stop spending money in terms of votes. When we talk about this crisis situation in our community, the answer to us is that the hospital wings and nursing homes are being closed. That may be true in southern Ontario, but we have only one small hospital, which has never closed its doors, and we need another wing or two. So what kind of an excuse is that?

1120

I also feel very sure that if they give us our extended care facility it will be used as well, because this idea of keeping people in their own homes as long as they want to stay in their own homes may work to a certain age, but here in the north, with our long, cold winters of 40 below and plenty of snow, it is one thing to help us with maintenance, and I think that is a very good idea and it will work for a number of years, but they had better start planning transportation as well if they expect to keep people out there when they can no longer drive.

It would be more sensible to build an extended care home, a sister home, which we want in the community, and there would be a natural progression. The senior senior citizens, who are mostly women, would go to extended care; the seniors in the apartments who can no longer manage as well, into our minimal care home, and the people who find it too hard and lonely in the country would come in to our senior apartments in town.

It seems to me that governments have to work closer with communities. They give grants of money for certain things whether they meet our needs or not. If the federal government gets its house in order and passes on the needed money to the provinces and it starts working more closely with the needs of the municipalities, we may yet get things back in balance and start working together on that huge deficit that the government keeps talking about. But it can only be accomplished by putting people back to work, collecting fair taxes and using the money wisely when it is collected.

We feel that Canada has one of the best systems in the world, especially the health system, but it is in grave danger of erosion, and each and every person, including seniors, has to do his part to make it work. Every level of the system, from federal, provincial, municipal, right down to

each individual, must take some responsibility to keep it intact.

Mr F. Wilson: I think it is appropriate that after hearing from Mr McFayden, we hear from yourself, madam. Thank you very much for your presentation.

A common thread I see between Mr McFayden's and your presentation seems to be the willingness to participate with the feeling perhaps of a sense of loss of power, lack of power, lack of control. Given, I guess, the *précis* that governments are elected to govern—and our governments tend to do that whether the people like it or not—and given also the mandate of this committee to reach out and to find ways of allowing people, insisting on people participating, I would like to pose that question to yourself. How do you see the radical changes that are going to take place, some of them the result of this committee? How do you see the ability of groups such as seniors, such as students, such as workers, of a more direct participation in the system that you say must be responsible?

Ms Davis: One of the things that I see as a senior is that we have to teach each other that our pensions are quite good now compared to what they used to be. There are more pensions, like Canada pension added to the other old age pension, but I see seniors have to realize all the way through that they have a responsibility to Canada too. We cannot just sit back and say, "Oh, we are 65 now, so the government can keep us." We have to all play a role in doing this.

My grandmother did not have enough money to live on her own, and right down through the generations, but I see our generation now, we must quit thinking that we need to be taken care of. We are being given money to be taken care of and if we act responsibly, we can contribute something. This community complex here is certainly an example of what the seniors have done in Dryden.

I am a member of Patricia board, a minimal care board, and of course I am not speaking for them, but I have seen since I went on that board where sometimes the lack of communication in where we need to spend a certain grant of money, it is earmarked for something else, and I think there needs to be closer communication.

Of course, I realize we are in the process in Ontario of doing the new medical and outreach program, but I feel, from living in the country myself, and I still drive, that you have to look at the cost of transportation. You cannot keep an elderly person out there in the country, in the cold, and not get him in to town, and maybe it would be cheaper to put up more low-income apartments in town.

Seniors cannot just have everything they want; we have to ensure that they get what they need, but we also have to encourage them to see what they need. Does that answer your question?

Mr F. Wilson: I think so.

Ms Davis: I think that is where seniors do fit in. Of course, our study group is senior and we are actively working in the community to take our part to see that this is done, because there are more and more seniors and less and less employed people to look after them.

Mr F. Wilson: Right. I see what you mean. I think it is put in the perspective that as long as the government can open and keep open those channels of communication, groups like the seniors will fill them.

Ms Davis: Yes.

Mr Beer: I would like to thank you for your presentation. If I can ask you a question, because I want to continue on the line that Fred was asking you about, it seems to me that you hit one of the fundamental problems that governments, and not just governments but all political representatives, have, and that is how we communicate both what we want to do and then how in fact that particular program, whatever it is, is delivered.

In essence, you have been talking about long-term care and looking at issues that affect you in this community, and quite properly and appropriately note that in trying to deliver better health support care in the north there are problems of distance, there are problems of isolation, and those have to be incorporated in changes made in province-wide programs to really meet the needs that you have.

At the same time, often what we hear and what we have heard today is that we want a strong federal government that does what it is supposed to do well and a strong provincial government that is going to do what it is supposed to do well. So the dilemma then is, how do we build in that community input, which everyone in this room would say is vital and important, so that we could have programs—but they would be different. Perhaps if the needs here are different and one needs more extended care facilities or more small apartment buildings in the more isolated centres where people can come together, then why can that not happen under the aegis of the same program?

I wonder if as you look at, say, the particular needs that you were talking about in terms of health care, and you mentioned you were on the Patricia board, where is the level and then, I suppose, what is the proper size, in a sense, where we work out that kind of detail? Because my sense is that no matter the political party in power at Queen's Park, there is an acceptance increasingly that we have to find a way to get down to the community, to some meaningful definition of community so that it is not me in Queen's Park saying, "Thou shalt have such and so," but "Look, here is the kind of money we have available for this program, here are some guidelines; now you plan it."

Ms Davis: I can only answer for myself here and now. I am not representing them.

We had a study done in Dryden and we were planning a sister home to be built on, extended on Patricia Gardens, and it was well thought out, as Mayor Jones will tell you. We are now separating families, husband and wife, up in years, and one will go 85 miles—you know where Kenora is, you have just been there—and the other one stays in Dryden. Now, how on earth are you going to get that elderly person—your idea of aging in place and everything is wonderful, and we were going to incorporate the home support and all of these new things in there, but they took the study away from us. They said the district of Kenora had to do it, and now it will be another year or so down the road. We have been in a crisis for a number of years.

Minimal care home, as you know, is minimal care. We have 18 extended care people. They have medical records to say they could go in but there is no place for them. The hospital is overflowing. People are out in the halls at the hospital because they have to wait for a room.

So I feel that this added study, I could not understand why the whole district of Kenora had—I tell you, I kept this simple because I really do not pretend to understand it all, but it seemed like a backward step to me why they could not accept what we were trying to tell them here.

The same with the hospital. They were supposed to have phase 2 of their hospital. In fact, it even came out in the paper. Now it seems that the whole Kenora district is to get a chunk of that money. In that case, there will not be enough to do one hospital if it is all divided up.

Somehow there has to be better communication in this. I also believe, as I tried to say to this gentleman, that we must take care of the elderly. They will want to cling to their home as long as they can, but we need to know that is the best place for them to be. I can quite assure you that out in the country on long, cold nights in winter and so on—you have to remember that maybe where they should be is in a small community where there are people around them. We have to be very careful not to have too many programs out there that are too expensive for the government and not meeting the needs of the senior.

1130

DECADE COUNCIL

The Chair: I call now Freda Hoshizaki.

Ms Hoshizaki: I have to tell you that I am also a member of the council and Tommy Jones is my mayor, so I will keep this short and to the point. He has me really well trained.

We are a small group of women who meet occasionally to deal with issues of interest to women. After looking at the position paper on the Constitution and endless rhetoric in the newspapers, we could find no reference anywhere to women's concerns. Did we not learn a lesson from Meech Lake, that disenfranchising 52% of the population will have the same askew results as Meech Lake?

When the federal government next tries to gather together people to sit around a table or stand around a resort to engineer changes in the Constitution, we would ask the Premier of Ontario to make a strong representation to ensure that women are represented at that table. To us, a strong central government is essential to ensure that the programs important to the welfare of women remain in place. Without federal control, social programs will erode. Affirmative action will be the first program to disappear. Pay equity will not exist. Social programs have to be protected.

There are 14 million women in Canada who did not have representation at the previous talks. They have been absent at negotiating tables. It is time they are heard. There you are.

Ms Churley: I would just like to thank you very much for your presentation. I have been waiting for it.

Ms Hoshizaki: I assure you, there are several more coming. There is a group in Thunder Bay which is our parent group; there is one in Toronto, and they all are presenting.

Ms Churley: It is also interesting that you came just at this point, because I have been reading, between deputants from time to time, a paper prepared by a group of women in Toronto who were very disturbed at being left out of the Meech Lake process. I would be pleased to get a copy made for you if you are interested. It is very good.

Ms Hoshizaki: I would, yes.

Ms Churley: I just wanted to ask you to elaborate a little more on how you would see women being more involved in the process. Are you talking about more women actually being at the negotiating table, or more women in general speaking out on the issue?

Ms Hoshizaki: I would like to see them at the tables at all junctures of the process, from the beginning right up to the signing of the Constitution. I think with the Premier we have in Ontario we are likely to see it; he is the person who will ensure that there are women at the table. But we feel very strongly that we were represented by 11 males by proxy the last time, who really had very little understanding of the programs that are important to women, what happened to them, literally, and where they would be going.

Mr Malkowski: It reminds me of Agnes Macphail, who was the first elected woman who spoke on the issue of pay equity, and her thoughts still carry with us today. I have a question for you: How do women participate in the structural formation of this Constitution committee? How do you think women's voices could be heard in the consultative process and in the decision-making process? Do you think it should be a self-governance group? Understanding that you want the rights of women to be recognized, would you like to run that particular arena yourselves?

Ms Hoshizaki: I come from Manitoba. I come from where Agnes Macphail came from. I really strongly feel that women have to be represented in the complete process, right from the beginning to the end. I do not think that meetings at this level really do much good. I think you have to have more power. I think you have to have the women who are in the governments, who are in place now, at the table. We have good, strong women in all the parties at the federal level. I would trust them to represent me at the table.

Ms Harrington: Your question is how women are going to get more involved and make more changes. Is that not it? You are asking how women can have more say in this whole question of what is Canada.

Ms Hoshizaki: Yes.

Ms Harrington: My answer is, get elected. Really.

Ms Hoshizaki: I am too old.

Ms Harrington: I am speaking to every woman.

Ms Hoshizaki: I believe that very strongly, that women should get elected. I spend all my time talking to the younger people and young women in the community to

try to get them on the municipal council or in provincial elections. Not everybody is happy with it, but I love it.

Ms Harrington: I just want to stress that this is a year for municipal elections, and this is where any woman should be starting. There are many changes you can make outside of government, which is probably what your group is doing. What is the name of your council?

Ms Hoshizaki: It is the Decade Council. It is part of the Decade Council in Thunder Bay, and the Ontario Association of Interval and Transition Houses, because we are concerned with the crisis shelter house in Dryden and in Kenora.

Ms Harrington: I was involved for many years with the YWCA, trying to get changes for women, and even with the National Action Committee on the Status of Women. But that is still outside the actual power of government; it is a side role. I would suggest, really, that women get involved in politics, and I would like to say it is not as bad as it seems. Once you get in there, it is a lot of fun.

Ms Hoshizaki: I think so. I was watching Rosemary Brown last night on TV and the talk was about women in politics.

Ms Y. O'Neill: I am very happy that you said you would have confidence in the women who are elected, because we have taken the responsibility that you are suggesting others take and we do need support from groups such as yours. I am very happy that you are encouraging other women to enter politics, because that is where decisions are made, and I think you understand that. Thank you very much for supporting us.

1140

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. You have talked very well about the necessity to address women's issues. There is not anyone, of course, who would disagree with that. The second point you make is that, in your opinion, the best way this can be addressed is to a strong central or federal government. I hope I am not misinterpreting.

Ms Hoshizaki: No, this is what we are saying.

Mr Offer: Has there been any thought through your group as to whether the issues which are so very important to you and to so many could be maybe more effectively addressed if it was all within the provincial area of responsibility?

Ms Hoshizaki: We have talked about it several times. What happens is that if the transfer payments are made to the provinces and they are not allocated to certain programs, they build highways. You know they do; you have been in the government long enough to know that this is actual fact. With libraries in small towns, if that percentage of money is not allocated to the library from the provincial government, they do not get the funding. It is very hard to support these types of services unless the money is allocated strictly to that, and we want it coming from the federal government. Alberta is looking at the erosion of the social network.

DRYDEN CITIZENS INTERESTED IN CONFEDERATION

The Chair: I call now Jeannine Mascotto from Dryden Citizens Interested in Confederation.

Ms Mascotto: I am Jeannine Mascotto. I am a professor with Confederation College here in Dryden. In preparation for this submission, I telephoned 22 Dryden citizens. Eighteen had prior commitments, board meetings and travel. All of them expressed their deep interest in the topic and regretted that they could not attend the meeting on Saturday 2 February. There were four of us there and we drafted this submission for your committee.

We, the Dryden Citizens Interested in Confederation, urge our Ontario government to work hard to preserve Canada as we know it. We believe Canada can grow to become a much greater nation than it is now and that we need the 10 provinces as a unified nation in order for this to happen. We want this country to stay together and work on adjusting to the needs of all the provinces.

We Ontarians can continue to build our province, and thereby the nation, by welcoming immigrants. We must address their education and language needs so that they will quickly become contributing members of our province and nation.

The country of Canada has immense human and material resources, and it should have a strong national purpose. National unity requires support and substance from all the provinces and all components of the nation. Each province has valuable resources to contribute to forming a united Canada. The strength of a nation depends upon united people.

Separation by Quebec or any other province would affect the country quite adversely. Our financial position in the world would certainly be in jeopardy. Other countries would not be anxious to do business with an unstable country, whether the instabilities were of a financial, cultural, linguistic or constitutional nature.

Canadians of many origins have been trying to build a unified multicultural society that is unique to the rest of the world. Our country is based upon welcoming others from other lands. Let us Ontarians continue that tradition. Let us Ontarians urge Canadians nationwide that our land of varied cultures is rich and worth preserving.

Mr Beer: Thank you. I think we have been saying this to a number of the witnesses appearing before the committee.

Ms Mascotto: Yes.

Mr Beer: We recognize that on somewhat short notice, telephone calls, meetings, whatever, have been held. I think it was noted yesterday by our colleague Margaret Harrington that while it has been short in some respects, the fact that people have come together so quickly and perhaps have a somewhat more spontaneous response has none the less been very valuable because we have noted in so many of the presentations the strong feelings about the country, about the role of the national—

Ms Mascotto: Yes, the sense of urgency.

Mr Beer: That has come forward. I would like to ask you one question. Perhaps this came up in your discus-

sions. I think we are all being open and honest here, and one of the things that has troubled me is that when we talk about our country and how much we want to hold together the country as we know it, it seems to me that an important part of that has been the fact that we do have one province which is very different from the others in terms of Quebec, where the majority of the population is French speaking, and that in New Brunswick and Ontario and Manitoba we have large French-speaking populations.

Over the last number of years, but even before that, the role of the two languages, English and French, has been important. If we were sitting in a small northern community of Quebec, similar to Dryden, I think we would be hearing from people such as yourselves talking about our country, but talking about their language and what they felt was its importance.

Do you think we can resolve that linguistic issue in a way that is going to be acceptable? Because it seems to me, and you may disagree with this, that either we find a way of accommodating and accepting our two languages in a fair and equitable manner or there will not be a Canada as we know it today. To me, the consequences of that make the cost of trying to ensure a basic level of linguistic rights to anglophones in Quebec and to francophones in Ontario legitimate and worth while.

I am just not sure whether perhaps we have thought through the consequences sometimes of saying, "Well, we don't need to worry about the role of the French language," whether in terms of federal services or provincial services. I just wondered, is that an issue that you had a chance to discuss at all with your colleagues, or just personally what your sense of it is.

Ms Mascotto: Our group meeting on Saturday was really a wonderful experience because none of us are what you would call close friends, but through the discussions we became a unified force. We do believe basically that Canada is a celebration of varied cultures, and yes, there is no need to be in despair over the situation. There are Canadians, we believe, who will continue to try to persuade people that there is value to both languages, to many languages, and that bilingualism is a good thing.

Ms Harrington: I just wanted to continue a little further with that. Were you able to get a copy of our discussion paper?

Ms Mascotto: Yes, I just got it this morning, thank you.

Ms Harrington: The eight questions in it are the ones that we were hoping that people would deal with and very sincerely look at.

Ms Mascotto: We would probably be willing as a group to go through this at a later time.

1150

Ms Harrington: Great, if you could, because obviously you are very dedicated people from the community. If you could put in that other hour and more and get back to us with something, we would appreciate it.

Ms Mascotto: Yes, thank you.

Ms Harrington: One of the questions dealt with justice for Canada's aboriginal people, which is something I would hope you would look at. The other question, which Mr Beer I think was dealing with, was the role of the English and French languages in Canada. As you know, that is a very divisive issue. Would you be able to summarize how you personally feel about that role of French and English in Canada?

Ms Mascotto: I think Ontarians and Canadians learn many, many things. We are all subject to learning every day. We learn in school and we can learn other languages, to at least understand and accept and celebrate in the joy of other cultures and the use of other languages. I should add, Mr Chairman, that I have travelled extensively too. Many of your prior speakers have noted that, so the feelings may come from having travelled.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation.

RAINY RIVER DISTRICT COMMUNITY LEGAL CLINIC

The Chair: Our final presenter this morning is Kenneth Koprowski from the Rainy River District Community Legal Clinic.

Mr Koprowski: Thank you, Mr Chairman, members of the committee. Just to give you some idea of where I am coming from, I am a member of the Law Society of Upper Canada and have been a member of that august body since 1974. I had been in private practice in London until the early part of last year. In April 1990 I took on the position of executive director of the Rainy River District Community Legal Clinic, sponsored by the Ontario legal aid plan. It has its main office in Fort Frances, Ontario, and a satellite office in Atikokan. I oversee both offices.

I recognize that there are at least two difficulties with being the last scheduled speaker. From my point of view, one is that after hearing all the other speakers, I realize they are a tough act to follow, and second, from your point of view and the others listening in and the cameramen and what not, I realize it has been a long two hours and people are getting restless and they want to end. Let me assure you that I intend to make my comments brief. That does exist—a lawyer who makes brief comments.

I am not going to get on a soapbox. I simply wish to share with you some concerns that I have. I am pretty good sometimes at raising issues; I am a little deficient in coming up with answers to those issues. I wish I could come up with something that would be a panacea for all our difficulties, but I cannot. I know I cannot and I am not so sure that there is anyone who can.

However, I implore you, let not the deficiencies in this presentation in any way detract from the significance or the importance or the substance of the issue that I wish to address you on today. That issue is the one issue, the question raised in your discussion paper: How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?

There is no doubt in my mind, as I am sure there is little doubt in yours, that this one question alone could take up all the time that you have in these public forums. I am not certain that I myself today can give justice to that in

the time that I have been allotted. Let me just say that when I was called yesterday and invited to make a presentation, I made arrangements to make the oral presentation and then submit a written brief in the not-too-distant future.

However diverse the many particular issues may be in this question, the answer to this question very often comes down to resolving the often unnecessary conflict between the issue of recognition of self-government and that of granting self-government. I say "unnecessary" because the Indian Act, for the most part, already has preserved the former.

Official recognition of the fact that aboriginal peoples have had their own legitimate forms of political institutions is only very recent, in the 1983 report of the special committee on Indian self-government. For a long time aboriginal people relied not so much on the written word but on a variety of distinctive ways to organize, operate and record political ideals and institutions. A dominantly non-native society did not appreciate these effective means of self-governing, but instead attempted to impose a uniform set of what I would call Euro-Canadian political ideals on vastly differing native societies from coast to coast.

As I said, I am not so sure that I have a complete answer for this, but I somehow feel very strongly that part of the solution can be summarized in the three words: honour treaty rights. Ostensibly, section 35 of the Charter of Rights was to protect those rights except that the section has been interpreted to refer only to those rights that existed as at 17 April 1982, the date that the Constitution Act became law.

This in itself seems to be an injustice. Why should it be so restricted? Why should it not include even pre-1867 treaties? The Ontario case of *Agawa* prescribed a public interest in conservation purposes should prevail over rights originally granted to the natives. On the other hand, the Alberta case of *Arcand* gives priority to the original rights thesis. We must question therefore why those treaty rights should be subject to the rights of others who themselves came on the scene only after the treaty was signed. There may be answers; maybe it depends on the wording of the treaty. I do not know, but one has to question that.

Does government give in to the interests of private groups and associations whose interests are at variance with those of the native population? I do not know and I am not implying an answer. Is it because those voices of those groups are louder than the natives? I do not know that either. But if it is, then that attitude goes only so far until you have a summer of discontent as we have just experienced. Why not therefore amend regulations under our statutes dealing with such things as hunting and fishing rights in order to give credence and effect to the original treaties, or is this to be avoided as well in order not to offend some popular interest group?

Remember the treaty was there first. Give priority to those treaties and remember always that doing what is right is not necessarily that which may be politically popular. I am not implying at all that in the past things were done only to be politically popular.

Consider as well our province's income maintenance legislation: Family Benefits Act, General Welfare Assistance Act. Take the time to listen to native groups when they suggest methods of amending the legislation to reflect the needs of natives particular to reserve life. Listen to them when they suggest ways in which to set out more appropriate criteria for determining entitlement to social assistance because of difference in life on reserve as opposed to off reserve.

Expand the entitlement to special assistance needs that are particular only to reserve life. Is it time to review the provisions of CAP, the Canada assistance plan, as it relates to allotments to provinces to assist these people? Consider their housing needs, the dilapidated state of some of their buildings, their lack of proper sanitary and sewage facilities. This cannot be left entirely in the hands of the federal government. Your government discussion paper itself recognizes this.

What about the administration of the justice system towards natives? Are more natives being placed in jail than non-natives for relatively minor offences under, for example, the Provincial Offences Act. If so, why? Should the present penalty provisions of the act be amended? Should some of the procedures be amended? Why not watch closely the experiments in Sandy Lake and, I believe, Attawapiskat where natives administer the justice system using a combination of provincial federal laws and Indian customs? Why should they be restricted or this plan be restricted to isolated communities? Why not consider more appointments of natives as justices of the peace or more native lawyers as provincial judges? Get the native perspective on the bench.

1200

What about working with the federal government in trying to bring about greater self-government on reserves, not necessarily all at once but gradually over a period of time? I do not think it is reasonable to expect that the natives on reserves can suddenly know overnight how to resume self-government when we have deprived them of that for almost a century.

Why not also consider, as part of that self-government, entering into co-management agreements with our provincial Ministry of Natural Resources, relating to the resources on reserves and in treaty areas? Who created the environmental problems in the first place? What about, therefore, greater legislated controls over the polluters of our environment, or will this too offend private interest groups?

Indians are not, nor they should be regarded as, simply crown subjects in need of protection and so-called civilization. They are not utterly incapable of managing their own affairs, as some might have implied. Your government now, sir, has a golden opportunity to make Ontario a leader in establishing greater native self-administration, not necessarily to the complete exclusion of the provincial or federal governments, but by instilling in them greater confidence, over a period of time, in their ability for self-management, to an extent that they feel it is within their capabilities, as ongoing dialogue will reveal.

Your own discussion paper states that if Canada is to endure, it must change, it must reform and renovate. If you truly mean that, then you will inevitably be faced with making decisions which, although not necessarily popular, will nevertheless be made with that end in view.

Someone once said, and I think this might be a sign of the times, that a non-native, envious of the monetary grants, tax exemptions and other benefits granted to natives, said that he wished he were an Indian. The reply given to him was that if he wished to be an Indian, all he had to do was give away everything he had and wait 200 years.

Consider seriously what the natives want. Listen to them. We have been told by your various representatives that your government is a listening government. Put an end to that waiting.

I do not have the answers, ladies and gentlemen. As I said, I raise the issues. I wish I had the answers. How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? I cannot answer that in one sentence. But walk a mile in their shoes, see things from their perspective and do unto them that which you would want them to do unto you if you were in their circumstances. I told you I would be brief. That is the end of my submission.

The Chair: There are just a couple of minutes left. I am not sure if we will be able to get through all the questions. Let Mr Winninger start.

Mr Winninger: Thank you, Ken, for your impassioned plea on behalf of Canada's natives. We certainly heard some rather compelling submissions yesterday when we were in Kenora, and your submission certainly follows logically from those. Since the native land claims decisions you cited, there have been some Supreme Court of Canada decisions, as you know, in Sioui and Sparrow, and both levels of government, I believe, are taking steps to come to terms with those decisions which tend to enshrine native hunting and fishing rights. Certainly charges were dropped by our Ministry of Natural Resources against members of the Golden Lake band for hunting and trapping in Algonquin Park.

I applaud your arguments with regard to developing self-government for natives. I would ask you a question, though, related to something a little different. You bring a rather unique perspective, having lived in an urban city in southwestern Ontario and having practised law there, and then having elected to move up to this area. I wonder if that perspective gives you any different views on the future of Confederation than someone coming, say, just from the south or just from the north of Ontario, might have.

Mr Koprowski: It was one of my better moves, I might say. Let me just say that the perspective has changed as a result of my coming north. My views now are affected by what I have seen since coming to the north. I do not think they have really been affected very much at all by what I saw in the southern part of Ontario, because in a much larger centre I certainly did not have the interaction with such issues that I do now, necessarily, in a smaller centre where such a larger part of the population is native. Moving up here certainly has changed my perspective.

Mr Winninger: How has it changed?

Mr Koprowski: It has made me more aware of the concerns and more aware of the issues. I really was not aware of them down in London. That is not to say that people cannot be aware of them in London. I am just saying that I was not, but because of the move to a smaller centre where you have more interaction with these people, I have become more aware of them.

Mr Beer: I thank you for your presentation. I would not want you to be at all concerned that you were the last one this morning, because frankly I think in some ways you have answered some questions. Maybe I can throw something back at you so that when you sit down to write it may come back from you in more of a, "Why not try this?"

It seems to me we keep searching for what we should be doing as a province with the native community and working with it, and in point of fact there are a number of things that have happened. You mentioned some of them, the policing arrangements and the co-management agreement in Temagami, for example; in the social service area, the arrangements on children's services; on welfare services, Weechi-it-e-win Family Services and so on. You may be aware that in the drafting of the new social welfare legislation which is bringing together the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act, there is native representation and in fact a special working group to look specifically at whether natives should be part of that new omnibus bill or whether we need to have something separate and distinct to try to address some of the issues.

Mr Koprowski: I am aware of that. In fact I have made a submission to that group already.

Mr Beer: Oh, good. I am glad to hear that. You have talked about then, in terms of self-management and self-administration, that these are areas where the province in particular, because we do not have the constitutional responsibility in terms of the ultimate self-government—perhaps that is the road we should be going in terms of that jurisdiction we have in working with the native communities that want to in effect take over, bring back, the right of self-management, self-administration of a number of programs, because we as a province are not going to be able to resolve all of the issues affecting the treaty rights and the role of the federal government.

I am just wondering if that is, at least in our context as a province, a road that we might be pushing in our comments to the government, be saying to continue down that path because whatever else, that will help as we get closer to the perhaps more difficult issue of how to structure self-government later on.

Mr Koprowski: Clearly, yes it is. I do not think there is any question about that, although one has to be very cautious in taking that route and not trying to do everything all at once. I think there are dangers in that, but surely that is the course to embark upon; no question in my mind.

Mr Bisson: For an individual who comes here and says he does not have the answers to some of his own questions, I think you have done an extremely good job. I

think it is the honesty in the way you approached this committee and really tried to struggle within yourself to try to first of all ask the question, because at first you can ask the question; then you can look for the answer.

You mentioned a number of things. I would like to be able to sit and talk to you as an individual for about a day because I think you raise a number of interesting points. You talked about the need to be able to adjust our legal system to suit the needs of the natives and understanding their culture and doing things somewhat in their own way, because again they are not the same thinking as us, they are different.

You raise an excellent point with regard to co-management of resources. Again I allude back to the beginning: You said you do not have answers. I think that is key to what you are saying. There are a number of things that you talked about, and I think underlying what you are saying—and I would like to get your view on this—is that you are basically saying that you, being the person who is transplanted from the south into the north, had the opportunity to come and live among people in the north who are somewhat different in their thinking to the way things are done in the south, and with that got a greater understanding with regard to what some of the native problems are up here and what the problems are of the northern people.

I am just wondering if you can share with the committee any wisdom you may have, and with other people out in the province, in trying to tell them that once you sit and ask the question and try to share some of the feelings of other people, then your understanding becomes different and some of the answers come forward.

Mr Koprowski: First of all, let me say that I am heartened by your referring to the south of Ontario. I still have not got used to referring to southern Ontario as down east. That is what they say here, so I am glad to hear someone still refers to it as southern Ontario.

There is no question in my mind that, as with anything, you are not really going to get an understanding of what various groups or individuals face unless you are close to them. I think, certainly in my case, in having done that by moving up to Fort Frances, that alone opened up all sorts of information to me that I would not have been exposed to.

That is the key. As far as any wisdom to grant to other people is concerned, Mr Bisson, I am not so sure that I am capable of imparting any such wisdom to other people. All I can say is what I think to be common sense. If you want to do something for someone, or if you want to help them, what you have to do first of all is understand what the problem is so that you can then determine what the solution can be, and the only way you are going to understand the problem is to interact with those people, not just read reports or read newspaper articles or something like that.

You have to hear them and you have to listen to them, and again I hark back to what I said earlier, just a repetition of what your government has said, that you want to listen. That is an awfully good start. Then, once you listen and take time to sit down with them—if you do not have time to sit down with me for an afternoon, Mr Bisson, you can sit down with some of the native leaders for an afternoon

and you will get a great deal more insight than you would from me, I assure you. But that is the key. There is no question about it. The wisdom comes from that interaction.

Mr Bisson: In closing, I guess there is one thing I would ask of you. I do not know if you presented your brief in writing to the committee. Have you?

Mr Koprowski: As I mentioned earlier, I did not have time. I will be presenting it.

Mr Bisson: I would like to get a copy and I would like to thank you because I think you raised some important points and opened the eyes of a lot of people. I want to thank you for that.

The Chair: We will end with that. Thank you, Mr Koprowski.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: May I just make a request? If you are going to present a written brief—I found your insightful statement that self-government cannot be just taken for granted from the natives and there will have to be training in self-government—from your experience, could you say a little bit about that when you send your written piece to us, because I do think it is something we are all going to

have to wrestle with. How can we best help the native population to develop the self-government structures they will need?

Mr Koprowski: All right.

The Chair: In closing this meeting, I would like to thank those of you who came to talk with us this morning. I think we have certainly found, as we have so far throughout the hearings, that there are a number of very strong feelings that exist among the people of the province and that they are feelings that range obviously and touch a number of issues and are feelings that we will try to consider very seriously as we put together our report to the Legislature.

Thank you for that and for the hospitality here in Dryden. We move on to Sioux Lookout this afternoon. If you or anyone who is following us on the parliamentary channel is interested in following our proceedings, they will continue to be televised through the parliamentary channel.

The committee recessed at 1214.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1504 in Queen Elizabeth District High School, Sioux Lookout.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. On behalf of the members of the committee, I want to say we are pleased to be in Sioux Lookout this afternoon, continuing our hearings with the select committee on Ontario in Confederation.

This is the third stop in our trek across the province. We are pleased to be here in Sioux Lookout, particularly because we are going to do things a little differently this afternoon. Our proceedings have been broadcast so far and will continue to be broadcast through the parliamentary channel, but this afternoon we are broadcasting using the facilities of the Wawatay communications network which is centred here in Sioux Lookout. Our proceedings are being broadcast throughout northern Ontario and we will also be using those facilities later on to give people listening in across the north an opportunity to phone in and speak to us through the radio network. That is something we are also quite pleased about.

We also are delighted that we are here this afternoon at the Queen Elizabeth District High School and that we have in the audience a number of the students from the school. We will be opening it up a little later on, asking the students who want to talk to us to come forward and do so.

Before we do that, I want to do two things. First, I want to introduce the members of the committee. This is a committee made up of members of the provincial Legislature of the three political parties: the NDP, the Liberals and the Conservatives. I want to introduce the members of the NDP: Gary Malkowski; Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee; Margaret Harrington; Marilyn Churley; Fred Wilson, and David Winninger. From the Liberal Party we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steve Offer. From the Conservative Party we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick. Also joining us this afternoon is your local member of the provincial Legislature, Frank Miclash, a Liberal member.

We are delighted that Eligah Morris from the Muskrat Dam is here, and he will do an opening prayer. I will ask Eligah Morris to do that at this point.

[Prayer in native language]

The Chair: Speaking to the students earlier, I noticed there were a few of them interested in coming forward and sharing some of their views. I would like to invite them to do that now, if they would. Come to the table, please. For our records, we need to have your name and then you can go ahead.

TOIVO KOIVUKOSKI

Mr Koivukoski: My name is Toivo Koivukoski. I would like to direct this question to the PC representatives. I am confused about something. I have heard the word "Confederation" tossed around rather loosely over the past few months. It seems to me that what our country actually is is a federation, a country in which the federal govern-

ment has the majority of the prerogatives. It seems completely erroneous to me to be giving these prerogatives to the provincial governments when it was this federation our country was founded upon and that holds it together and keeps it strong, yet we seem to be giving these prerogatives away and tearing the country apart with things such as the Meech Lake accord. I would just like to ask you why we are doing this, why we are tearing our country apart like this.

1510

The Chair: This is a bit unusual. We are more used to having people talk to us and then us asking questions, but I think anything is fair game.

Mr Harnick: I can only say that Ontario's position in determining the kind of Canada we are ultimately going to have is very important. This exercise we are now involved in is in part to decide what powers Ontario should have, what powers all of the provinces should have and what powers the federal government should have. I do not think you are on the right track if you think this is strictly a federal ball game. It is very much a provincial ball game. The provincial governments across this country are as equal as the federal government, and we now have to deal with this difficulty of determining what our new Constitution should look like, if changed at all, and I think that is what this committee is trying to deal with. We want to hear the views of you and your schoolmates. We want to know what kind of Ontario you see as being the right partner, and the right place for Ontario in Confederation.

The Chair: Are there any other students who want to come forward and say something to the committee? If there are people who want to do that a little later, please signify that to me as we go, between speakers. We would be happy to try to slot you in as we go along throughout the rest of the afternoon.

JACQUELINE RUNDLE

The Chair: I would like to call Jacqueline Rundle from CUPE Local 2141 to make a presentation to us.

Ms Rundle: I am here today as a resident of Ontario and a Canadian citizen. I have broad interests and activities, but due to the short notice of this committee hearing I was unable to get in contact with and receive authorization from the people I represent. Some of the people I represent in an elected capacity are the members of CUPE Local 2141, the municipal workers of the town of Sioux Lookout. I am involved in the Ontario division of CUPE, that is, OMECC, Ontario Municipal Employees Co-ordinating Committee. I am the area 1 rep for the north. I am also on the race relations committee in Sioux Lookout, on the advocacy committee.

Unfortunately, I cannot speak legally for any of these people, so the views I present today are my own, trying to keep in mind a very objective approach, realizing that what I have put down here is ridden with problems from many

angles. I have tried to be very objective and I hope you will bear with me.

The Chair: Just before you proceed, I want to be clear about time. As I said earlier, we want to leave as much opportunity as possible for people to phone us later on, so if you are able to keep your presentation within 15 minutes we would really appreciate that.

Ms Rundle: I was slotted for 30.

The Chair: That is why I raised it, because for individuals we have 15 minutes. If you would bear with us, we would appreciate that.

Ms Rundle: Okay. What do Ontarians want and where are we going? To begin with, I would like to look at the values that I believe we uphold and share in Canada.

We have an excellent medical care system. I would like to see it kept that way. Worldwide we are envied for our excellent medical plan, and it is not to be undermined by federal or provincial policies. I understand that on Friday in Parliament a bill went through that is going to begin to undermine this. I am very concerned about that.

The education system we have is available to all. We have an excellent quality of education. Again, it has its problems in certain areas and regions, but basically, from my worldwide travels, we are envied for it as well.

The various cultures we have in Canada, I believe, create a beautiful mosaic of people: our music, our different languages, the immigrants who come who enhance our uniqueness as Canadians. Other values: The aboriginal ancestry gives depth and understanding to Canada. If you combine the Inuit, Cree, Mohawk, Haida, Ojibway, etc—I cannot name them all—they again add to the mosaic of Canada.

The democratic system of government, of the people, by the people, for the people—constantly, no matter what I hear in the media or even what I see happening in aspects here today, I realize we are the people and we have to speak out. I really treasure the democratic system.

CBC radio and television quality broadcasting enriches the lives of many people, especially in isolated areas such as here and beyond. That is the only way we have of keeping in contact with the world.

International reputation: Canadians are well thought of in Europe, Australia and Scandinavian countries. I do not know how the world war we are in right now is going to change that, but basically we have a good reputation.

The labour laws in our country are something I value very highly, and I know the people I work with and for really value that. It gives the workers rights and recognition to organize and improve their working standards.

The international economy: Canada must secure the country's future, exports and trade, but not at the cost of Canadians' jobs or livelihoods. Free trade has taken so many thousands of jobs away from Canada. Why do we call it free trade? What are we trading?

Ontario must be the safeguard, set the policies, as we are a have province and looked up to by many of the other have-not provinces. Only when Canada is secure in its own country regarding its economy can we begin to branch out—again, not at the cost of the working people.

Federal and provincial governments: What is their role? Seeing you all here today, the three parties represented, made me feel good and realize that we must work together, not against each other. We have a federal government that says it represents a majority of the people of this country, yet it sets policy and implements actions that the majority of the people do not agree with and find it very difficult to accept.

Some examples are free trade, the GST, cutbacks to the CBC, undermining the medicare system, reducing Via Rail service to isolated regions that need it and reducing transfer payments to the provinces, thus increasing the tax load on the provinces. What is happening to this money they are holding back? Are the Canadian people given any account of that? Ontario must lead the way, speak the voice of the people and not allow this eroding of Canada to continue.

Aboriginal justice: The treatment past and present of the aboriginal peoples of this country is shameful. There is a trail of broken promises that has caused so much suffering. It is unthinkable that we allow it to continue. It is time to clean up our act and let the aboriginal people have their own voice in what happens in their lives. The Ontario government is given the challenge to make this happen. If I could just go on a bit here, we look at South Africa and we shake our heads in disgust. We look at Australia and its apartheid and we shake our heads in disgust. We look at the treatment of the Negroes in the United States and we shake our heads in disgust. This summer in Oka, what did we do about it? Did we shake our heads in disgust? That is a very important issue.

Language and the French-English issue: I used to think when I grew up that Canadians were tolerant, loving people, but due to the federal policy, the language issue has turned into a hate issue. What is happening to us? We must accept each other for what we are. We are different, unique and special individuals with different backgrounds, and the leading politicians—all of you sitting here today—must lead us out of this mess. It is unacceptable the way it is. It is turning us against each other instead of to each other. I could go on and on about this.

I think it would be very sad to lose Quebec. It is a part of our country. It is part of our Confederation. It is what helps make Canada what it is today. What are we going to do? I could go on about pre-Constitution days, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms—freedom and rights for whom and for what parts of Canada?—but I will not. I am time-limited here.

1520

The regions: Atlantic, west and north: These isolated, smaller-populated regions feel they really do not matter much to the rest of Canada. Train service has been cut down to an almost non-existent level and northern tax deductions are being eroded. Fuel, transportation, medical, food, clothing, education and living costs are so very expensive up here, but no one is listening. These isolated regions need to be heard from and represented in government on the provincial and federal levels. The heartland region, southern Ontario and Quebec, must shoulder some

of this responsibility and help to take part in the care of the less fortunate members spread across the rest of Canada.

What does Ontario want? I would like to dwell more on how we build the bridges we need to bring all this together. I see in my vision the Ontario government providing leadership and accepting its challenges with a positive, progressive, humane attitude. The province of Ontario can do the following:

It can secure jobs for its people and not let them be sold out across the border, set policies that ensure jobs for its people. How many times in the papers have we all read where X amount of millions of dollars were given to a company in southern Ontario, then you follow it up a year later and the company has pulled out of Ontario, down to the United States or Mexico, and the people who were left working there have nothing left?

Let's listen to the aboriginal people of Ontario and honour their rights. Let's listen to the women of this province and begin to implement policies that honour their rights. Pay equity that was implemented in this province is inadequate. I worked with it; it is a shame. It is a shell of something that could have been something really great and grand. In our own town we are still dealing with a lot of backlash from this. Social programs must grow to suit the people's needs, not diminish to suit a political party's budget needs.

Vehicle insurance must be fair.

Workers' rights and provincial labour laws must ensure that the workers of this province are respected and regarded as a people, not as a commodity or a piece of equipment that wears out. The Workers' Compensation Board must be overhauled to ensure that the pain and suffering of the injured worker is a top priority, not how much it costs. Let's see what is really going on there and do something about it.

Senior citizens' pensions, housing, medical care programs, etc.: Again, it is another whole issue that deserves hours of attention and I do not have it right now.

I believe that we the people of Ontario have a big challenge before us. The government of Ontario has an even bigger challenge, for it has to please us all in some way. But I believe that by working side by side and including the people of the province as part of the solution and keeping them informed as to what is happening and setting up more hearings like this one, with more notice so that everyone receives enough notice to organize and make a complete presentation—I think that is very important, as I believe that today you have only touched the tip of the iceberg. There is more to come. Thank you for this opportunity.

The Chair: I know there are some questions and I will give people an opportunity to ask those and you to comment. I just want to say on behalf of the committee that we are quite conscious of some of the concerns you raised about the process and the time, and we realize that that is an issue for us to deal with. We certainly see this as the beginning of a discussion process and we will be looking for ways to make sure that that discussion does continue in the months to come and following our interim report.

Mr F. Wilson: You have described those things we hold dear as Canadians and as Ontarians, things we pride ourselves on having. You also describe some of the problems we are having with different aspects of those very things. You have given the government a challenge and what you think the government of Ontario should do.

As a labour activist, I would like to ask you what role you see organized labour playing in addressing some of these problems and addressing the matter before us today, the future of Ontario. Labour being under siege as it is right now from various aspects of our society, even so, what kind of insight can you give us, what kind of suggestions do you see for labour as an organization to play in the rebuilding or redefining of Ontario?

Ms Rundle: It is no secret that behind the NDP stand a lot of workers of this province, indeed across Canada, because it has been the only voice that really seems to have answered their needs over the years. If you read your history, it is all there.

I think a lot of the labour people are very organized. For example, on OMECC, which I am on, there are 10 areas in Ontario that are divided up so that every region gets representation, and those of us from the north who come from the very small locals are funded so that we can come down and be given the respect and the time to make our presentations, etc.

I think they could both learn from each other and I do not mean, as labour, it is just, "Union, rah, rah, rah," which I happen to believe in, but it is the workers of the country who really have to be listened to. Only 35% of the labour is organized in Canada. So people just seem afraid to mention the word "union" in a workplace that is not organized, and I think people—like here in our own town, the difference in wage between organized labour and unorganized. So I think they can work together and learn from each other. I think with the present government in Ontario I am looking forward to that happening and being pace-setters.

Mr F. Wilson: I realize the connection you are talking about; I come from that background myself, but the approach we are taking here of course is called a non-partisan approach. All three parties are dedicated to redefining Ontario, defining our role in the new, renewed Confederation, or whatever form it is going to take. Organized labour, 35% or not, is really the voice of labour in Canada, because it is organized. I am wondering if you have a role, perhaps, for those organizations that represent those people, something that will take them beyond the normal and necessary reactive protection that they must do for their members to become, I do not know, a voice perhaps for all workers in Ontario. Is there a role that you see there?

Ms Rundle: Being where I am, I know where I am at. I cannot speak for them. I cannot speak for the president of the Canadian Labour Congress or Ontario Federation of Labour or whatever.

Mr F. Wilson: If you could speak for them or to them, what would you say?

Ms Rundle: I think we are doing a great job and let's keep it up. That I am here today, able to get time off work,

arrange things so that I as a labour activist could get on this thing is a start.

Mr F. Wilson: That one thing, in fact, is something you would like to see, I would think, for all citizens to be able to do. It is a small thing, but nevertheless—

Ms Rundle: Yes, I would like to envision across Ontario—and I know it is going to be expensive, etc—but many groups, like the seniors, where are they today here? We have many seniors in this town. Were they given a chance to know what is going on? Same with the labour people. What is happening?

Again, I would like to leave what direction we should take to the people who have been elected in Ontario in the labour field. That is their job and they are doing, I think, a great job on that. I feel very confident that it can only get better.

Mr F. Wilson: Thank you. Your faith in your elected officials is refreshing.

Mr Offer: May I first say to Ms Rundle, thank you for a very comprehensive brief. It not only talks about values but it also talks about the issues and it seems to combine them both into certainly a story as to what is important from your perspective and what will continue to be important in terms of issues and values for Ontarians. I think that will be very helpful for us as we continue our deliberations.

My question deals with the issue that I think is underlying everything here. That is, of course, we are now grappling with the fact that Quebec is on the verge of asking for more powers, for more responsibilities which may have always been federal responsibilities. They are asking for responsibilities and the rights to exercise those responsibilities in fields which previously were within the federal area of jurisdiction. My question to you deals with that aspect, not so much from Quebec's perspective but from Ontario's perspective. You have dealt with values, you have dealt with issues, you have combined them both very well. My question to you is, what should, in your opinion, Ontario's role be? What should Ontario's position be, when we know as a fact that Quebec is on the verge of asking for more powers? Does Ontario have a role to play, and if so, what should that role be, keeping in mind the values and the issues which you have so well illustrated in your presentation?

1530

Ms Rundle: I will not speak for Ontario; I will speak for myself, which I am much better at. I do not know, it is a real mess. It just seems that something somewhere along the line has gotten totally out of hand. If you give Quebec what it wants, I fear the rest of the provinces will say, "We don't have a Confederation any more." If you do not give it what it wants, by now things have escalated in Quebec in such a way that its political leaders feel they are destined to split. Something happened a long time ago, in the pre-Constitution days, that made Quebec feel very offended about the way it was being treated and it has grown to something that is beyond the people of Ontario.

I do not know. All I know is that as an Ontarian I would feel very sad. Quebec comes from France origi-

nally, or whatever, and when I was growing up it was not French Canadian or Italian Canadian or whatever; you were a Canadian. You happen to speak French? Great. Now suddenly it has turned into this two-language issue. It has gotten really distorted. I do not know what the answer is. I feel helpless. That makes me again, like I said, feel very sad about the whole thing. I fear that we are going to lose Quebec.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation, Ms Rundle.

GARNET CZINKOTA

The Chair: I would like to call Garnet Czinkota from the Sioux Lookout Chamber of Commerce. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Czinkota: Thank you. Honourable members, I am Garnet Czinkota. I am the past president of the chamber of commerce. I have been asked on behalf of the chamber of commerce to make a presentation to you today. Our president, Dick MacKenzie, is away at sport shows and I extend his regrets to you for not being here. I was not able to gain consensus of a lot of the chamber members prior to this presentation due to the short time that I have had to prepare. The remarks I make, correspondingly, are therefore mine and they are tempered with the concerns of friends and business acquaintances.

Sioux Lookout, the town I was born in and raised in, has changed dramatically over the past few years. The community is now composed of about 40% native persons. This has happened in a very short time that we have had this demographic change. These changes have brought social and economic problems and benefits to Sioux Lookout. A recent race relations committee report entitled *Together We're Better* highlighted some of these difficulties. On behalf of the race relations committee, the chamber of commerce is pleased to have presented you with copies of the report *Together We're Better*. I just gave them to Tannis at the front there.

The solutions to these difficulties are being found by the people who live here. They are being found because we want to live together. We in Sioux Lookout believe that every Canadian has the right to an environment that is mutually supportive. In fact, resolutions to divergencies arise through a process of "novelty in combination," which in turn enables individual groups to achieve essential empowerment.

The solutions from the people, to be effective, must be bottom up, both created and driven. In Sioux Lookout we realize that we have here locally a great need for training programs. In order to provide the opportunities for self-advancement, we need to offer educational programs that allow people to compete successfully for jobs. In doing so, they will increase their self-worth and they will be able to make a valuable contribution to Canada. I believe that Sioux Lookout will prosper and grow in the years to come because of the commitment that people have to each other. We in Sioux Lookout believe that together we will be better.

Over the past several days before coming here, I have tried to gain a consensus from my business acquaintances in Sioux Lookout as to how they feel about Canada. By

and large, they are proud to be Canadians, but they are not really sure, like I am not sure, what that means. The only time we are truly Canadians and call ourselves Canadians is when we are out of the country, visiting some other place. Then we will identify ourselves to our hosts as Canadians. The rest of the time, when we are at home, we identify ourselves by our ethnic background or the region we are currently living in. This confusion of national character has come about in the past 10 to 15 years and is one of the contributing factors, or resulting factors, that has been caused by Canada's multicultural policy.

To gain the support of Quebec, the last several federal parties in power have rewarded Quebec with subsidies and grants out of proportion to the rest of Canada. The federal government has become designed more and more along traditional French lines. Knowledge of the French language has become a prerequisite for advancement within the civil service anywhere in this country.

Our Constitution has been redesigned to institute a French-style top-down government where what the citizens can do is defined and guaranteed by the state. As a federal response to this coerced attention from one linguistic and cultural group, a multicultural policy was devised as a sop to the other provinces, which encourages immigrants to replace Canadian culture with their own. The multicultural policy which was designed to enhance Canadian culture has contributed to its demise.

The federal official bilingual language policy has likewise damaged the Canadian identity. The aim of the bilingual policy was to make Canada institutionally bilingual. There was no intention to force all Canadians to become bilingual. This meant that a certain number of designated federal jobs would be done by bilingual people. It would be the same as going to work as an accountant: You would have to know accountancy to be able to do the job. It was just part of the job. If you did not have that language or that aptitude, you could not do accountancy, you would not seek that position. The whole purpose of bilingualism was to give a unilingual person the feeling that the whole country belonged to him, that he would be comfortable in Canada coast to coast. Bilingualism was never intended to allow an anglophone to live in Montreal and speak English only. It was meant to allow a unilingual person to go and get stamps at a post office anywhere in Canada, and that was the extent of it.

However, bilingualism has polarized the two populations in Canada. The number of English-speaking people in French Canada and the number of French-speaking in English Canada are falling, not just relatively but absolutely. The two populations are separating. They are voting with U-Haul trucks. They are moving to different parts of the country. That is the exact opposite of what bilingualism was supposed to do. Bilingualism was supposed to make it possible for people to live happily in Quebec City and speak English, and vice versa, but it has not. It cannot be, because there is a limit to what the federal government can do to a free people in a relatively open society. You just cannot make a Canadian by passing laws.

1540

In a country as large and as complex as Canada, with two languages, many cultures and all kinds of conflicting interests, it is extremely difficult for people to develop a sense of belonging. You cannot achieve unity simply by preaching a political doctrine of unity.

It is not only the provinces that feel isolated and alienated but regions within the provinces, and therefore you cannot link this country together through provincial capitals any more than you can do it through Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal. We in northern Ontario suffer also from this same regional identity that causes us to feel remote, removed and snubbed by Toronto.

I think we should reject the centralist, interventionist vision of Canada which Pierre Trudeau imposed on this country more than two decades ago. That means rejection of nationwide, official bilingualism and multiculturalism, uniform social programs and huge regional equalization payments. It means returning to our roots and transferring most major government functions back to the provinces where they belong and where they were put 125 years ago. That transfer will mean that the federal government will also transfer much of its bureaucracy, tax revenues and power to the provinces. The federal government would be left with truly national functions such as defence and security. Due to our size and economic wealth, the province of Ontario has a great role to play in the future of Canadians.

The bigger and the more interventionist the national government becomes, the higher the degree of friction and animosity that is bred. We must recreate Confederation and acknowledge that this country is far too vast, far too varied for a powerful national government. The best solutions for a new Confederation will come from the bottom up and will be driven by the people who want to make them work.

At this time Quebec has opened negotiations for redefining Confederation. The considerations that Quebec has requested should be considered to be its opening position for negotiations. The rest of Canada should now respond in kind with its considerations. The province of Ontario has the right to demonstrate leadership in putting forth terms, some of which might be the following points.

If Quebec chooses to separate, it is the responsibility of the remaining provincial governments to protect Canadians. Any breakaway province must be made to realize that it must repay its debts immediately. It also must be denied the opportunity to use the Canadian dollar. It must also be denied the opportunity to use the international reputation of the Bank of Canada. It also must be denied the opportunity to forge a separate economic union with the United States. These may sound like threats, but they are actually enlightened self-interest.

If Quebec chooses sovereignty, it must be reminded that the Ungava district was Rupert's Land and will remain part of Canada unless Quebec chooses to buy it. The south shore of the St Lawrence was largely settled by English settlers and should remain part of Canada unless Quebec chooses to buy it. The St Lawrence Seaway should become an international waterway unless Quebec chooses to buy it and maintain it at cost.

Reality now is that the two founding races are becoming outnumbered. Compared with French Canadians, there are more German Canadians in Calgary, more Italian Canadians in Vancouver. Canada is not just bicultural, it is multicultural. Like other families in a crisis, Canada can only stay together if the parties involved want to make it work.

In Sioux Lookout, we have chosen to work together because together we will be better. The sheer economic dependency, as well as the dire economic consequences of separation, are the most compelling arguments for setting aside our differences. Canada, with its disparate ethnic groups, may never be as congenial a group as the Beachcombers, but there is absolutely no reason we cannot learn to share one roof together.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Czinkota. There are more questions than we are going to be able to accommodate. We will start with Mr Harnick.

Mr Harnick: This morning and yesterday we heard from several witnesses. They were all of the opinion, almost unanimously, that Canada needed a strong federal government. The reason they all came to that conclusion was because they wanted to see a Canada where national standards were set and each province had the same standard for education, for health and for other social programs. You now have an opinion that is quite different from that opinion.

What I want to ask you is, how do you justify decentralizing the federal government if it is going to lead to a Canada where each province will have different standards when it comes to social programs such as health, education, welfare? Is that not going to cause more economic disparity across this country? Is it not going to be counter-productive to all of the problems we are trying to solve?

Mr Czinkota: I do not know.

Mr Harnick: You see, I do not mean to put you on the spot, but you have brought something up, you have given us an opinion and I want to know what the basis of that opinion is because it seems to be, with respect, quite contrary to what other witnesses are telling us.

Mr Czinkota: Charles, it is a little difficult to argue very strongly that yes, there will be pain and yes, there will be regional disparity in that those provinces and areas that can afford the social services that we currently have and currently expect to continue having may not be able to afford that. In the regional subsidization and the programs that give the money from the federal government across all the provinces, there will be a lot of pain that would come out of that. But it is not working the way it is right now. I would suggest that western Canada is feeling a little ill put to have to continue to subsidize Quebec to keep it in Confederation.

Mr Harnick: Let me just stop you there for a second. Is it just a matter of this idea that people have—and I do not for a minute believe there is any factual basis to it, but quite apart from that—that it is a subsidization of Quebec and that really, but for that one isolated opinion, you would like to see a Canada where all the provinces are equal, or not equal.

Mr Czinkota: Not equal?

Mr Harnick: Equal in terms of what they offer to each of their citizens.

Mr Czinkota: I would like to see a world that does that for everyone, but the ability to pick up that pricetag is far beyond any government to be able to do. I do not think our interest in the humanities and otherwise will allow us to write a cheque that big.

Mr Harnick: But do you not think that what you are proposing is going to be moving quite away from that goal?

Mr Czinkota: Yes, it would be.

Mr Harnick: Okay, thanks.

The Chair: There are a number of other questions, including a few that I would like to ask, but time does not permit. If you are able to stay around, Mr Czinkota, perhaps we could talk with you informally after we end the formal part of the proceedings.

Mr Czinkota: Tony, I appreciate the offer. Thank you.

The Chair: I am going to move on to the next speaker now. I call Margaret Fiddler, who is the principal of the Wahsa Distance Education Centre to come forward. Not here yet? Okay. We will come back to her.

BRIAN BEATON

The Chair: I call then Brian Beaton. Go ahead.

Mr Beaton: Hello. I would like to address this group just as an individual, not representing any other group. My name is Brian Beaton and I am a white man of European descent, as everyone might see. I was brought up in a very WASP background with a strong emphasis on hard work. I grew up on a farm in Cumberland, just outside of Ottawa. I am part of the seventh generation of farmers in that area and my brothers are still farming and raising their families there.

1550

I would like to just take a moment and acknowledge everyone who has come today to Sioux Lookout. I appreciate everyone travelling so far to come and visit our small community, listen to people like myself and take our message back to the people who will be planning our future direction in these kinds of matters. I would also like to acknowledge the Oji-Cree and Cree translators from Wawatay, who allow us to share our thoughts with the people from the Nishnawbe-Aski nation and who are here translating our words.

I would like to just take a moment and describe where I am coming from right now as a person. I am married to an Ojibway woman from the Lac Seul first nation, just outside of Sioux Lookout. Together we are raising our four children to be proud of their Nishnawbe heritage. We attend gatherings and participate in ceremonies throughout the region. My wife and my children all received their Indian names from respected elders in this area.

I work with a local organization providing a service to the isolated communities north of Sioux Lookout. I have been fortunate to visit most of the communities in the Sioux Lookout district and work with the people in the

area. During the 12 years I have been with my wife I have worked with a number of native organizations throughout northern Ontario. Coming from southern Ontario, moving into the north has been a very mind-expanding experience for me. I often wondered what the north was complaining about. I think I appreciate it that much more now as a result of this experience. I have a great respect for the Nishnawbe people, their values, their spiritual understanding, their traditions and beliefs. I have learned more from Indian people than I can ever repay, and for this I am grateful.

For many Nishnawbe in this area, the native language is still their first language. The Ojibway language and the Cree language are two of the three native languages that still have the possibility of surviving. It is very difficult to raise our children to be proud of who they are as Indian people when the native language is not used in our home and when there is little support for the use of the language in our community.

By returning to Sioux Lookout, we hope we can begin to reverse this situation for our family. My brother, who is still on the farm, married a French Canadian woman who is very proud of her heritage and who has been able to retain her language because of the separate school system and her community where she grew up. The main language in their home is now French and their children are perfectly bilingual. My brother has only learned French in his home as a result of his wife's efforts, much to her credit. This is now rubbing off on the rest of our family, who attempt to speak French and are learning the French language as a result of this experience. They make the attempt to speak to my brother's children in French. I feel it makes everyone very proud that they have this new skill to communicate with others.

The Sioux Lookout school system here in Sioux Lookout is administered by the Dryden Board of Education. Education directions, policies and decisions reflect the makeup of the entire region from Ignace through Dryden to Vermilion Bay and north to Sioux Lookout. French immersion has just been introduced into our local school system. All these issues I think can be expanded upon in terms of political decisions that end up getting made at a provincial level, and that is what I am coming to in terms of my discussion.

I understand that over 50% of the children in the schools here in Sioux Lookout are native. There is a native-as-a-second-language instructor for two schools here in Sioux Lookout, and I understand that there is one classroom assistant at the school who is native. I am not aware of any other native staff in other schools in this town. This is also the case throughout most of the town, except within the native organizations here.

So often we are affected by policies created by well-intentioned people who have very little understanding of our needs. We are forced to compete with our neighbours for the limited dollars that are made available and the one who comes closest to meeting the objectives of these well-intentioned bureaucrats usually gets the pot, usually gets the money for the programs that are available.

Within the organization I work with, we have to be very sensitive to community needs or we will lose their support and our organization will not be in existence any more. That is a reality that we live with. So often these well-intentioned bureaucrats, public servants, create policies and programs which end up being at the expense of others. I find that in our case here in Sioux Lookout, the French immersion program might be one of these types of programs.

I read on Saturday, for example, in the Saturday paper, that the Lakehead Board of Education actually made a surplus of up to \$62,000 for having the French immersion program in its schools from the grant structure that is in place from the Ministry of Education, for example. This is one example of the types of policies, and I want to make it very clear, for the French families here in Sioux Lookout and for those people who want their children to leave this community and go someplace else, I am really glad that the French immersion program exists here. There is nothing wrong with the French immersion program, but I do think, in my own case, for my own family, another program such as native immersion, if that is what it should be, might be in place. There are a lot of other possibilities here.

Maybe you have heard about this analogy, but I think it is applicable in this case. The government and our country are much like a house which requires many servants to maintain the various parts of it. The people who live in and use this house usually make the decisions on how their home should be managed by the servants, not the other way around. So often with public servants, we end up having to be the recipients of their policies now. I think that if servants started to dictate how your house were going to be operated, I would wonder how long they would be around. Unfortunately, in our case the public service tends to be continually growing and growing and growing. I do not know whether the effective change that is required can happen with the existing structures that are in place.

In the case of government, politicians and the public service, I feel they have been telling us how to live our lives for a long time. I am hopeful that this consultative process that is taking place today is the beginning of a new era that is happening within Ontario. On the other hand, I guess I will just have to wait and see if what is said is understood and acted upon. That is the challenge I think I present to everyone here.

One of the situations that tend to arise a lot is that in order to solve the problem, the public service, for example, has to be expanded. Another person from this area is hired by the government to provide input and also usually move into another area, southern Ontario in most cases. This just drains the region of potential leaders and developers.

In thinking about this presentation, I thought of the French people and aboriginal people in terms of all of these policies and programs enacted to meet their needs. Often in the case of aboriginal people, the discussion boils down to, "This is not our responsibility; this is not our area; this is federal jurisdiction; this is provincial jurisdiction." The ball gets tossed back and forth. As a result,

many people in Ontario are living in Third World conditions.

People will only put up with this type of treatment for so long before they decide to do something for themselves. They act much like caged tigers pacing back and forth within a small space set up by someone else to work within. If given the opportunity the cat will usually choose freedom, and who can blame it? I would suggest that the same exists for Indian people and for French people in this nation.

1600

I would just like to conclude by making a couple of recommendations from this discussion.

I think the values of greed and exploitation of both people and natural resources that exist within our dominant European culture and reflected in the policies and programs that are in place in a lot of the cases need to be replaced with traditional native values of sharing, truth, kindness and strength.

All people deserve equal treatment and respect for their differences, and recognition that aboriginal rights and aboriginal treaties need to be honoured and built into the Canadian Constitution.

All regions and all people should be able to negotiate as equal partners in our Confederation.

Finally, appreciation that change is happening around us. It should be appreciated and celebrated when people and natural resources are not being exploited by others. I think change can be good, not for the sake of change, but when good directions are taking place. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Beaton, for sharing with us some of your personal experiences and projecting those in some suggestions for us. We have a couple of question.

Mr Malkowski: I really appreciate your sharing your experience and what you have seen between the native and the French community in northern Ontario.

Regarding the Constitution, what would you like to see included—the recognition of a government structure giving power to the community, including the French and the native community, to aid them in developing among themselves? Should the structure recognize what they want rather than having the government dictate what they want? And on this, what kind of policy can you recommend to the government that it not show the community but that the community show it? I wonder if you have any suggestions on how this may work.

Mr Beaton: I think this process that exists today is a good model. I think if people invite others to attend and participate as equal members in a discussion where those values that I just shared were present, where there is the respect and the openness that can exist, that would be a constructive first step. I think I am not the right person, coming from my WASP background, to answer your question about the French and the Indian people. They need to be asked, they need to be listened to and they need to be respected in that discussion.

Mr Malkowski: If I could just have a supplementary question, on the situation in Quebec, my question is:

Should they have recognition as a distinct society and what would your reaction be to that? Are you in agreement? I am just interested in your perspective.

Mr Beaton: Well, I am not sure what it means, "distinct society." I think they are a special group of people with a special gift that we all can learn something from. I do not know what else to say in terms of what should be granted. I think whatever needs to be granted that can show these values I have talked about needs to be put on the table and discussed openly and in consultation with others.

The Vice-Chair: We have a couple more minutes. We will go with Mrs O'Neill. If we are able to keep it short, we might be able to get another one in.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I cannot make that promise. Mr Beaton, you have really touched my heart.

Mr Beaton: Meegwetch.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You have used many words that I feel are so fundamental to what Canadians are all about. You have talked about your marriage and you have talked about your brother's marriage. Although your wife and I will likely never meet, we have something in common. We both married men from down east. As you know, this is a person from the southerly part of Ontario here. I from Ontario, from Ottawa-Rideau, married a man from the Maritimes and my marriage did what yours has done for you. It brought me to a new culture, a very different culture, and I feel that it has made me a better Canadian.

You talk about gifts of people one to the other, and that is what you have got from your marriage and what you are giving to your children, and I think that is what we should be talking about when we are talking about the Constitution and how we can achieve that. I just want to tell you that I represented the area of Cumberland on the Carleton Roman Catholic Separate School Board as well as on the Carleton Board of Education, and today when I walked into this school I also met a person who had taught in the town of Richmond, so Sioux Lookout has been very welcoming for me and I will remember it dearly and your presentation with great treasure. Thank you so much.

Mr Beaton: Meegwetch.

The Vice-Chair: Very good. That is all the time we have unfortunately. There are a number of other people who wanted to talk to you, and I think that expresses some of the insights you brought to this committee. I would like to thank you on behalf of the committee.

Mr Beaton: Thank you very much, and good luck.

NORTHERN NISHNAWBE EDUCATION COUNCIL

The Vice-Chair: We are going back to the top of the order. So that you people out in the audience know, they changed it all here; very confusing. James Cutfeet of the Northern Nishnawbe Education Council and Margaret Fidler, principal of the Wahsa Distance Education Centre. Is Margaret here as well?

Mr Cutfeet: She will be coming along as soon as possible. I will start with the presentation and she will join me.

Good afternoon, Mr Chairman and members of the select committee, ladies and gentlemen. If at some point in time the presentation seems to be disjointed, it is because the copy of my presentation came off the computer just a while ago. So be patient with me and we will see what happens here.

I am going to present at this hearing some of the concerns or the issues that have been expressed over the course of the years that I have been involved in native education.

With that said, I would like to welcome you to the southern part of northern Ontario. Sioux Lookout is the gateway to the north and gateway to the south for us. Like the farther south, we have highways, year-round roads, railroad and trucking services, electricity, water and sewage systems and central heating in our homes and buildings, access to daily newspapers and CBC television news coverage, telephones and fax machines.

1610

The Northern Nishnawbe Education Council works with 23 first nations located just north of the 50th parallel to Hudson Bay. There are no highways. Some of the communities have winter roads on the ice. There is no trucking or railroad transportation. Freight must be flown in at costs such as 70 cents a pound to Muskrat Dam and \$1.16 a pound to Fort Severn.

None of the homes have indoor water or toilets; only some of the communities have been electrified. There is no CBC television reporting on the Gulf war and no daily newspapers. There is one telephone in Slate Falls and North Spirit Lake.

The school in North Spirit Lake has been closed repeatedly for sewage, water and heating problems. It is infested with cockroaches and rodents. About one third of the school population is infected with contagious health problems directly as the result of the lack of the amenities that we take for granted.

This is Ontario, this is Canada in 1991. Where is the equality of opportunity or equality of outcome?

The first comment that I would like to make is directly to the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. The Premier may have announced the committee in December, but we received no information. Our provincial news comes through the CBC from Winnipeg. Until Wednesday of last week we had not heard of this committee.

We object on two grounds:

First, as northerners. There was no public information before last Wednesday. Federal and provincial announcements take longer to get to the north, if they ever get here at all. The time frame was too short for a properly prepared brief. You are beginning the hearings here less than one week after announcing the dates for the presentations, at least to our knowledge of the information.

Second, as native people. We see no plans to go to the northern communities. No information was sent to any of the native organizations locally—there are nine in Sioux Lookout—or to the NAN office in Thunder Bay. The Nishnawbe-Aski Nation represents 46 first nations in northern Ontario.

A major question of the community has to do with the rights of native peoples in the Constitution. It appears you were not planning to consult native people and native organizations. The process does not take into account any of the residents of the northern isolated communities.

This committee is dealing with important questions that will impact on the daily lives of Ontarians and Canadians. If this is truly a consultation process, then consult. One week's notice, one day for presentations, is not adequate consideration or consultation time.

I state the obvious when I say that there is prejudice in Ontario and Canada—the overt, the obvious and the ugly, but even more damaging, the covert and systematic: school texts that talk of British attacks and Indian massacres, texts that present Canadian history from the perspective of British imperialism but not the point of view of the first nations. Polish children did not read of the Russian occupation of the country. From the perspective of the first nations, Canada has been an occupied country for 400 years.

Canada presents itself as a peacekeeping nation, a first nation of justice, a nation that welcomes cultural diversity. Canada treats its first nations people like second- and third-class citizens. It is time for the country to formally apologize and begin to redress the situation, address the inequalities. The United Church of Canada recently has had the moral fibre to make such a public apology.

We as Canadians can thank a native person, Elijah Harper, for saving this country from the Meech Lake accord. In terms of the Constitution, the founding nations are the first nations. The British and the French were the first boat people. The first multicultural mosaic was that of the first nations, and that mosaic is fast disappearing with the loss of the native languages. The loss of language is also the loss of the culture. Not only are the governments, federal and provincial, not actively working to save the real heritage of this province and country, but they are actively assisting in the annihilation of it.

Wawatay Native Communication Society in Sioux Lookout, the only source of native-language news through radio and a twice-monthly newspaper, had its budget slashed. These hearings are being broadcast to the north via TVO. Only Sioux Lookout is being translated for the elders and people of the first nations who do not speak English. Signing is provided throughout for a much smaller constituency.

The Secretary of State of Canada completed a 10-month assessment of the state of native languages in Canada in 1985. There are 53 distinct native languages in Canada. Of those, only three will survive—Cree, Ojibway and Inuktitut—over a 10-year period. Unlike immigrant heritage languages, if native languages are lost in Canada and Ontario, they are lost from the world's knowledge. Canada is the homeland. There is nowhere Cree or Ojibway parents can send their children to regain the language and culture.

In 1987 the government spent \$180 million on French-language programs, \$18 million on heritage-language programs and a token \$2 million on native language. Native-language program teachers require classrooms,

dictionaries, grammars, curriculum guidelines, texts, audio-visual materials, resource staff and professional development. Literature must be written in the native language. Television programs must be produced.

Lakehead University in Thunder Bay offers the only native-language instructors program in Ontario. It provides instruction only for native-as-a-second-language teachers. The Ministry of Education does not recognize students who have native as their first language and does not provide native-as-a-first-language programs or teacher training. The native languages deserve at least the status of French and preferably of English.

1620

It is ironic that the first nations' cultures have more status in Europe, in France, Holland and Germany, than they do at home. Our soldiers during the First World War and the Second World War did not face prejudice in European stores, hotels and restaurants.

At the Canada display at the Epcot Centre in the middle of Disney World, Canada advertises its unique first nations heritage, but at home does nothing to preserve it. Germany has huge groups that celebrate first nations festivities. Neither the Ontario nor the Canada calendar recognizes any traditional first nations festivals or holidays.

There is economic disparity. Travelling from North Spirit Lake to Toronto is like moving through a time warp from the have-nots—have not electricity, water and sewage systems, telephones, access to news, decent school facilities that meet basic health and safety codes—to the land of the haves.

I want to add that in North Spirit Lake there are no wealthy people and there are no street people. Toronto has incredible wealth and homeless, uncared-for, sexually exploited street children and adults. It is time the south took some lessons in humanity from the north.

There is injustice. Treaty obligations, made with the Iroquois when the English needed military allies against the French, made with the Ontario and western first nations when the government was opening the land for settlement, logging and mining, have not been met. Land claims still sit in the courts. According to information from the Nishnawbe-Aski nation, there are 300 pending in Ontario alone.

There is inequity in the application of the justice system. The government is no longer trading smallpox-infested blankets. Canada does not jail a Nelson Mandela, but the last April budget cut money for native leadership and native communications. There are many ways to silence a people.

The Chair: Mr Cutfeet, if I could interject for one second, I just want to be clear because I am concerned, as the Chair, about the time lines. We are trying to be fair and apply the same rules to every group that is appearing before us.

I understand that you are appearing together with the Wahsa Distance Education Centre, and I just want to make you aware of the fact that you have spoken to us for about 15 minutes and we have allotted 30 minutes for groups that want to present to us. I just draw that to your attention

so that if you are presenting together, that is the time we have allotted and you may want to summarize the rest of the brief. We have the brief and we can read it, if you want to perhaps pick out what you think are the salient points from there. As I say, I just want to make you both aware of the time constraints that we are under because there are a number of other groups.

Mr Cutfeet: How much time do we still have, Mr Chairman?

The Chair: You have used up 15 minutes and I do not know how much time Ms Fiddler is going to need.

Mr Cutfeet: About five.

The Chair: Okay, then you can work that out between the two of you.

Ms Fiddler: He is my boss.

Mr Cutfeet: There are a few pages which I will just skip through towards the latter part of the presentation.

First, self-reliance: To be self-reliant we must have the autonomy, the authority to make the important decisions about our lands and our communities. The government assumed the right of control and wardship and we have been as orphans in our own land.

I mentioned "generosity" earlier. Generosity gives from a full heart and is not stingy. To be generous we must be loving, caring, compassionate and forgiving. Other values held of importance by first nations parents are harmony, integrity, courage and patience, trust, resourcefulness and modesty.

Tolerance of diversity: We tolerate the weeds in our neighbour's garden. We must teach acceptance and appreciation if this is to be a true pluralism. It is the differences that make a human tapestry richer.

It is time to clarify our values. It is time to insist that ethics be put back into science. It is time to ensure that the law is based on ethics. The legal system has become a lawyer's game of loopholes, not a seeking after the truth and a just outcome.

Northern Nishnawbe Education Council was established in the early 1970s and it serves 23 bands in this area. First of all, the district school committee, as it was known, dealt with the common concerns of the people and, at its incorporation in 1979, we began to deal with both: the common concerns of the 23 communities and the delivery of education services for off-reserve pupils.

The NNEC board of directors is made up of the chiefs or their appointees from the 23 bands in the Sioux Lookout district. The role that we play is to place students off reserve for further education. There are no high schools in the northern Ontario native communities. Only three of the 23 communities have grade 9 and 10 programs at home. If I may jump to the new system that we were offering our students, to give them some choice so that students whom we serve do not necessarily have to leave their home communities, I will skip to the Wahsa program, and I will let Ms Fiddler, the principal of Wahsa, explain a bit of the program that we operate now.

Ms Fiddler: Thanks, James. As James has mentioned, this is one of the exciting programs that NNEC is responsible for and has implemented. Wahsa Distance Education

Centre has come into being within the last year. It started actually with initial funding from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development last March, and as of last September we offered our first semester of accredited high school programs, the same as any provincial school or this school here in town.

There is one difference. Our students are located in 15 learning centres in 15 communities north of here. Our classroom is 200 square kilometres large incorporating those, and our teachers sit, as I am doing now, in Sioux Lookout and broadcast over the radio. The materials are sent up once a week and the assignments come down once a week and are marked that way.

It has to be one of the most exciting new projects going and I think it is on the cutting edge of what is happening across Canada with delivery of distance education. The reason it happened is because the parents, as James has mentioned, did not want to send their 14-year-old out to high school. It would be equivalent to you and me sending our children to Vancouver to live with a Chinese Canadian family, where there is no English spoken in the home, and going to a high school where there are more students than there are in one's entire home community. If you and I think in those terms, then we can understand why these students are happy to be at home.

We have found that with our clientele, our students this year, a lot of them are young adults who came out and got grades 9 and 10, went home and have had families and suddenly realized that yes, they would like that piece of paper and they are busy at it.

It is working. We have just finished our exams last week from the first semester and have proceeded this week with the next semester. The supplies were going out today and that is why I am late, sir.

1630

I want to stress the fact that this program is being successful because it is run by native people and is community-driven. That is one of the points that is most important that can be related to Sioux Lookout in northern Ontario, to the communities north of us which are in the spirit of self-government and interested in self-government and are beginning to see the successes of Indian control of Indian education and like what they see. That is something that perhaps needs to be taken back to both Toronto and to Ottawa in terms of native priorities and those of possibly other groups, such as the French priorities, that when groups are given a chance to do it themselves, they prove they can do it and the self concept rises and becomes successful.

We are funded by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and it has been extremely helpful to us. Some of the challenges have been within some of the Ontario ministries, where we want to offer accredited Ontario courses and have been considerably hampered, for example, by policies that we suspect come from the south and do not relate to the situation here.

As a result, for example, we were unable to access Contact North because it was set up and has been geared policy-wise only for provincial school boards, and Wahsa, as a native organization, is a private school but is not a

provincial school board. We have been shut out in that way and continue to be shut out when there are many dollars that have been recently allocated for programming and development of curriculum, curriculum design for distance education. This again has been set up for provincial school boards and we are unable to access that.

We would like to say that we know co-operation is possible. This is why we are being broadcast across radio. Our classes were bumped this afternoon for you ladies and gentlemen coming and we are delighted that our students are now listening to you in the north. As well we piggy-back on to TVOntario to get our classes up, and we realize that we are being broadcast in the south, so we know through the Wawatay experiences in liaison with TVOntario that one can work co-operatively with the province, even though it may be a federal program.

But I think the province needs to remember, with the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, that eventually these students will go into provincial schools and the more liaison we can create, the better the program will be. I wanted to share that with you. I know James has some more things he would like to share as well.

Mr Cutfeet: If I can just give a general gist, starting from page 9, both levels of government, federal and provincial, in the province have transferred programs to the local level or native administration. At times there are some difficulties with regards to that as sometimes the authority to manoeuvre within that space is limited, so therefore there is usually a minimal decision-making power. At times no true consultation is done as equal partners. In the name of consultation we are advised of government decisions and actions, federal and provincial agreements and interdepartmental arrangements impacting on our lives.

We are done to or done for. That is a powerless position. There must be a legislative change on a variety of levels. The simple one with regard to Wahsa is that within the Education Act, because Wahsa is designated as private, we cannot offer services to local boards or those boards that wish to receive our services. Right now the Education Act has a one-way street where boards provide to the native residents. So with regard to legislative change, that is one simple change that needs to be looked at.

More complex: We need to be at the table as equal partners in discussions. We need those discussions to take place at the community level. Chiefs and councils cannot afford to travel to Toronto or Ottawa for short half-hour and one-hour audiences.

We are concerned about the provision of quality education to the first nations' young people. A grade 12 graduation rate of less than 10% is not acceptable in 1991, which is what we face.

We need school facilities built to the same safety, health and educational standards as the province. We need qualified teachers. Lately we have had some native teachers working in our area. About 25% are native teachers, but somehow, somewhere along the way, the Ministry of Education needs to look at ways and means to increase the percentage of native teachers who could eventually serve

in our communities. In other words, Ontario must set up a more creative program to train native teachers.

Traditionally the north has been treated, as a people, as an empty storehouse, as resources for the south. When Leo Bernier became minister with the provincial government, the map of Ontario hanging in his first office blatantly reflected that attitude. It depicted Ontario as stopping at Sault Ste Marie.

An attitude change is required. The north does not exist for the profit and convenience of the south. Resources are continuously plowed into the Golden Triangle. Perhaps it is time to recommend a different system of parliamentary representation that takes into account regional differences, not just population.

The place of first nations: Consultation as equal partners is necessary to design the legislative changes that will provide for autonomy and self-government and settle the questions of jurisdiction.

We also need to look at first nations representation at the provincial and federal government levels, maybe by following the New Zealand system where certain aboriginal groups are allocated seats within the Parliament. Maybe that is one system that the provincial government, and even the federal government, can take into consideration.

Thank you for allowing us to be here. I will end my presentation right there.

The Chair: One question is maybe all that we will be able to fit in and I invite you, if you are able to, to stay with us after the proceedings so we can continue some discussion informally.

I just want to make two comments, to go back to some of the points that you made earlier in your presentation. I want to assure you that we are very serious about wanting to consult with the native communities. In fact, even before coming here to Sioux Lookout, yesterday in the hearings we heard from a number of native groups and we no doubt will continue to do so as we go through the province.

We realize that the time lines are very tight, but we also want to be very clear every step of the way that this first trek through the province is, for us, a first stage and that the discussions need to continue beyond this initial stage. We will be looking for ways to ensure that discussion process continues beyond that.

You have given us both in your presentation and in the material that you have provided us, I think, a lot of issues for us to cope with and to deal with, and I hope we can do justice to some of the things that you have put forward. But I just wanted to reassure you that we are serious as a committee about ensuring that we consult with all the constituencies, particularly with the native communities.

I think if there is one area on which there is very vast agreement among us, it is the whole question of issues that affect native peoples being something that we want to see very prominently on the agenda. I hope that will also be reflected in our report. I had Mr Bisson and there was a Charles on the list and I am not sure which of the two it was. Was it Mr Beer?

1640

Mr Beer: I know I am speaking for everybody on the committee to say that this is an incredibly exciting project. It is not every day as a committee that we see something that clearly is meeting a real need. I am sure that the kinds of problems you are facing can be overcome, because this is just too important for everyone that it succeed. I would like to focus a question on that.

I want to also just note that this idea about native representation is one that has been in the air. I believe in Nova Scotia there has been some discussion about the possibility of a designated seat in the Nova Scotia Legislature. I think that is something we need to think about as a committee with respect to our own areas in terms of ensuring more effective representation and involvement. So I really appreciate that comment in the brief.

With specific reference to Wahsa, I was very disappointed to hear the problems you had with Contact North, because as you were starting to go through it I was thinking that at some point it was going to come to Contact North and all the marvellous things it does and would that not be great. I think these are things we want to take back with us to Queen's Park and talk about with the Minister of Education and the Minister of Colleges and Universities, because really part of the mandate of Contact North should be, I would think, to be facilitating and helping you.

The other point here, though, is, would it make sense or have you looked at the possibility of yourselves becoming a board of education and seeking that role either under the Education Act or through some special piece of legislation, so that you would be able to receive directly various government funding and programs, or is it your belief that existing as you do as a private organization, and recognizing the federal involvement, you should just make changes in terms of your relationship with the provincial government so you could participate fully in all the different programs where at the present time they say, "We can't do that because you're not linked to a board"?

It seems to me there must be some administrative things that could be fixed, rearranged, which would then ensure that many of the things which the province does at the post-secondary and secondary level which would clearly be of direct help to you could happen. I just wonder, is that something you have looked at. What might we take back with us in the form of a recommendation that would help get you better provincial support for this program?

Mr Cutfeet: Within the Education Act, the Northern Nishnawbe Education Council is recognized as an education authority by virtue of the fact that Northern Nishnawbe Education Council is incorporated. Now the problem, the difficulty that we have is that Wahsa, in order to have it as a delivery system, is under private designation. That is where the difficulty comes. My organization can enter into a tuition agreement with a school board without any difficulty, but it is the private designation of the delivery agent that is of some difficulty for us.

I had posed the question to one of the ministry officials out of Thunder Bay that maybe what needs to transpire

here to resolve the issue is looking at our organization through the declaration of a political process under the memorandum of understanding negotiations, but I have not just yet received any response to the alternative that I had proposed to the Ministry of Education officials. I do not know whether they are going to pursue it or not. But that is certainly one way that this can be approached to resolve the issue and maybe have the Northern Nishnawbe Education Council enter as a pilot project, especially for this purpose of trying to create an inroad so that a native delivery agent can provide services to the school board or boards.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Chair, this is of great interest. I would like to request that we as a committee, through our clerk, send these two publications and the Hansard of this discussion to the Honourable Marion Boyd from this committee directly. I do not think we should just expect it to sift up. I think there are problems here that need attention, and I am sure Mrs Boyd would be more than happy to know of this.

The Chair: I think we can do that immediately. Then, in addition to that, we can take a look at the parts of the presentation that relate more directly to our work and again use our report for ways to incorporate those.

Thank you very much for your presentation.

EQUAY WUK (WOMEN'S GROUP) INC

The Chair: I call Laura Wynn.

Ms Wynn: My name is Laura Wynn. I am a member of Equay Wuk (Women's Group), and I am doing this presentation on its behalf.

Just a bit of background information on Equay Wuk (Women's Group). Equay Wuk translated into English means "women." Our membership consists of 106 women from Sioux Lookout, Thunder Bay and the remote northern communities. Our membership is not limited to native women. Equay Wuk (Women's Group) was established because of poor representation from ONWA, the Ontario Native Women's Association. To Equay Wuk members, ONWA is seen as an urban, politically oriented native women's organization, but Equay Wuk sees itself as a grass-roots organization. ONWA has a lot of political power. Equay Wuk of northwestern Ontario is determined to establish that same respect. In 1987, Sioux Lookout native women got together to form a northern women's group to bridge that gap. Our organization was incorporated in July 1989.

Many of the social problems of native people are the result of forced abandonment of our native language, our cultural values and traditional teachings. An inadequate local land base, lack of job opportunities and a lack of self-determination prevent our people from becoming more self-sufficient and self-supporting.

As a native women's group, we would like to address issues that pertain to native people—first of all, women's issues. We would like to applaud Premier Bob Rae for his brave decision to have so many women and visible minorities in his cabinet. Native women have an important role. They always have and always will. We are people's friends, we are the mothers, the wives, the nurturers and

the life-givers. Native women are excluded in most, if not all, decision-making, because decisions are made in Toronto or southern Ontario by men in majority. Our chiefs and band councillors are making decisions about family issues on our behalf and often without native women's input.

In cross-cultural work settings, native women experience problems with co-workers who disrespect our cultural differences and do not consider our opinions valid. Mutual respect in the workplace is a must. The need for more day care centres is urgent in the northern communities to encourage growth and development of healthy and well-adjusted native children. Existing midwives and their birthing practices that have existed for centuries are not recognized.

1650

For too long, both levels of government have not listened to native people's concerns. Remote northern communities or reserves need an adequate land base on which to build self-reliant economies. Economically speaking, northern communities or reserves are not well off. The need for future economic self-sufficiency is of great importance to ensure the future development of viable economies for native people. The women in native homes are the ones who most directly feel the effects of a poor economy. They attempt to make the best of housing, feeding and clothing their families on meagre welfare allowances or, if they work, minimum wage.

If the governments fail to acknowledge first nations people and their sovereign right to the land, events like the Oka crisis will continue to happen. Media coverage of those events jolted the Canadian general public, but the events did not surprise most native people. The actions of the Mohawk people were what many native people of Canada recognized as the Mohawks' last purposeful solution. Oka became a symbol for native people across the country.

Language and culture: We are proud to say that most northern women are fluent in their first language, Ojibway or Oji-Cree, and it is the women in the homes who pass this skill on to their children. Language is the basis of our culture and a skill we must keep.

Geographic location, or south versus north: Geographical location has been a long-standing issue. Decisions are made based on southern Ontario's concepts and values. Transportation to many remote northern communities is by airplane only, making living costs extremely high and putting what many of you may consider essentials far out of reach for native families.

In northwestern Ontario, or the Kenora-Patricia region, you can locate towns like Sioux Lookout, Dryden or Kenora, but communities like Fort Severn, Fort Hope, Sachigo Lake, Big Trout Lake, just to name a few of the 28 remote villages, are unheard of by many southerners and government leaders.

Health care: Health care for the northern people is still a great concern. Tribal councils are negotiating for local health control, a direct result from the Scott, McKay, Bain report. We applaud the efforts of our regional organizations and the various government agencies involved.

Abortion is a controversial issue for many Canadians, but for native people culturally, abortion is unacceptable.

Legal and justice: The justice system in the remote north has many problems. There are problems with travelling courts, interpreters, remand problems, legal representation, understanding the legal system and policing. These are just a few of the obstacles for native people.

Before the arrival of the Europeans, native justice systems were already in place. Tribal laws and decisions were respected and accepted as native people looked after their own. We need more incentives and alternatives like the program that was developed and is now in practice in Sandy Lake.

Just to recap: Equay Wuk women want to be treated with respect. We want to be recognized as important contributors to the existing world we live in. We want equal job opportunities. We want to live in a safe, comfortable, pollution-free environment. As northern women, we want to be a part of the decision- and policy-making consultation process that will affect our lives and, most important, our children of tomorrow. Last but not least, we want a guarantee that future self-government agreements include systematic equality and a meaningful role for native women.

Ms Churley: I just want to speak to you for a moment and ask you a question. I am going to drive my colleagues crazy, because I keep saying that I am here as part of an Ontario delegation in the Ontario government but I was raised in Labrador, in the north. I keep bringing it up because I am in the north right now and it is bringing back a lot of memories for me, because there are a lot of similarities. One of the things I remember about my childhood in Labrador was the pitiful and awful treatment of the native people, and it is bringing back very painful memories the more I hear.

But leaving that aside, because we do not have time to discuss it now, what I remember is a lot of the respect I have for nature, and a lot of the values you are talking about came from native women. I have personally a huge respect for native women, because I grew up in a community where I knew and spent a lot of time with native women.

I would like to have more time to talk to you about the issues you raised, but I cannot do it now and I hope to see you later.

One of the questions I wanted to ask you was around the whole issue we are here about, the Constitution and Confederation and what in the world we are going to do about it across the country. One of the concerns you raised, which has been of concern to feminists and women across the country in Meech and again is coming up, is the importance of equality for women and not losing the gains we have so painfully and slowly made, I think, in all our cultures across the country.

I am just wondering if you have any thoughts on the right approach to make sure that no matter what we do as a country right now, the gains women specifically have made in the past few years are not lost. I do not have an answer, but I am just wondering if you have thought about that.

Ms Wynn: In terms of social equalities that happen particularly to native women, I think it is important that we be a part of that process, where we can be included in decision-making. As part of the constitutional issues, I think native people have to be recognized and that mutual respect needs to be there. Otherwise, there is going to be conflict. We see the inequalities we experience today. We see the problem as a result of residential schools and a schooling system that was inflicted on a lot of Canadian native people. Native people today are still suffering from those policies. I guess it makes native people more determined to be self-sufficient, to be more conscious of establishing their own choices for education, for health care, for schooling, for whatever.

Mr Miclash: When you mentioned women in places of authority, in places of decision-making, I often think of various native women I have dealt with in terms of Chief Rosie Mosquito and many councillors, a native lady who is involved in the justice system you mentioned in Sandy Lake. Has your group given any thought or do they have any direction on how they will direct other native women into such positions of power and decision-making?

Ms Wynn: Right now, we are thinking about training programs for women. For native women and native people to take control, they need to educate themselves, to go to school, to take training programs so they can take over these roles and be responsible for their own care.

We have that in mind as a group. Our projection is the whole north. Our concern is the communities north of Sioux Lookout, those women we as a group are trying to work with, to deal with, to help them organize in their own communities, to take a role in what is happening in the lives of their families, in the lives of their children, to become active, to be spokespersons, to be on different committees, whatever.

1700

Mr Miclash: That is a very large mandate. I must say, I wish you and your group all the very best and success in this mandate. It is a very important one, as you have stated in your presentation.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Wynn, for your presentation. I am sorry we do not have any further time.

FRANK BEARDY

The Chair: If the next presenter, Frank Beady, would come forward, please.

Mr Beady: My name is Frank Beady. I am here as a first nations citizen who happens to be residing in Ontario. I am here as a parent representing my children. I am here because I am concerned about the future I will leave for my children. I have three children, a daughter who is 16 years old, a son who is 14 years old, and our baby son who is two and a half years old. They will be the ones who will have to wrestle with the problems and the issues we will leave.

I came here with very high expectations, feeling very good about the opportunity to come before you to talk about my inner feelings of what we are all about. I came in here feeling very happy to be a part of this process. It did

not take very long after I walked through that door to feel the disappointment in the air, because we are being told we only have 15 minutes to talk about the future of our children, 15 minutes for the town of Sioux Lookout, and half of Ontario three days, for those communities that affiliate themselves in a transportation system with the town of Sioux Lookout.

I find that deplorable. I had thought that when this government, the New Democratic Party, came in, things would change, that there would not be a whirlwind of politicians coming to the north asking us how they should govern, taking the time that we consider in seconds, or not bothering to even listen to what we have to say.

I am here to talk about the future of my children, but it is going to take more than 15 minutes to do that because you have to remember one thing—that we the native people and the residents of northwestern Ontario, the non-native population, have to educate you people, the politicians who are from the south, on what it feels like to live in northwestern Ontario. That education process, just the education process alone, will take a hell of a lot more than 15 minutes.

I listened to one of the chiefs who just called in about half an hour ago saying that he only heard half an hour before the broadcast started that this select committee was going to be in Sioux Lookout. I talked with one of the co-ordinators of the tribal council here, who told me that they only received the information this past Friday. I must say that I am very disappointed, because we are here to talk about the future of my children, the future of all our children.

[Remarks in native language]

Fifteen minutes—I think it is not right. I do not think it is right. I think that if you really wanted to get the pulse of the people, both native and non-native, living in the north, you should spend a full week in towns like Sioux Lookout.

I was very dismayed. When I walked in here, there were about 100 to 150 high school students who were seated behind us and as soon as the bell rang, pretty well all those students filed for the door. Maybe they are trying to tell us something, and yet we will go our merry way and not listen to them. It is their future that we are trying to talk about today.

It reminds me of a story that a friend of mine related to me a few years back. Going into an office building of a major corporation in Ontario, they were touring the building. The information officer was leading them along explaining all the technological advances that the company had been able to accomplish over the past few years. The buzzer went. In mid-sentence she looked at her watch and it said 4:30. In mid-sentence she was gone. That shows you the commitment that she had to her job.

1710

What you are imposing upon us shows you the commitment that you have in listening to us. I am not even going to try to beg that my presentation be not cut off. I am not even going to try to read the first few lines, because I am not going to water my presentation down for anybody. I am sorry that I have to speak in this language, sorry

because an elder of mine said in opening prayer, "Ask the Creator to bless the people that are here and ask the Creator for understanding." I am sorry but I just do not agree with what is happening here and it hurts me because I believe that we can live and work together no matter who we are. I believe in a country called Canada. Meegwetich.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Chair—

The Chair: Just a minute, Mrs O'Neill. I want to say to Mr Beardy that I am sorry that you have chosen, sir, not to proceed with your presentation but that you chose instead to use most of the time that was available to you to make your views known on the process. I think that is fine. That is quite fair. As a committee we will take your comments under advisement.

We realize that the process that we are undergoing is not perfect. We have said repeatedly, and will continue to say, that we do not presume in the time that we have at our disposal to be able to touch every considerable perspective or point of view that there is and allow every single person who wants to talk to us, to talk to us. We are trying to do our best within the times that we have. We have indicated that we see this as the beginning of the discussion process and will look for ways in which we can facilitate more discussion, continuing discussion, in the months to come.

Notwithstanding the fact that we have embarked upon the most extensive consultation process and travel process that any committee at the Legislature has ever done, we realize that in the context of the discussions that we have before us there is a great deal more that needs to be done. It is our job to look at what we can do and to ensure that the discussion continues.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Chairman, I feel very strongly that, particularly the last two presenters, are not speaking as individuals. They came before us. They indicated they represented many people. This last gentleman told us he has had calls from chiefs this afternoon. He is not speaking for himself. I do think that he should be given the 30 minutes. I know that we have time lines. We broke some of them yesterday and I think it was for the benefit of us all that we did that.

The Chair: The problem, Mrs O'Neill, is that Mr Beardy indicated that he was in fact speaking as an individual and as such I have to respect the process that we have agreed to, to apply the same rules as far as speaking equally. The committee can always change its mind on that. I do want to indicate to the committee that we also do have at least three other people who want to speak and we did promise that we would also open the phone lines. My understanding is that there have been calls coming which have been, again, put on hold pending the completion of the deputants who are here. It is a problem time-wise that we have.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I wonder if the deputant who was just before us would consider giving 15 more minutes in giving us his presentation. That is what I am asking.

The Chair: Well, I would be prepared to hear a little bit more on this, but I also do not want to spend another 15 minutes discussing this topic.

Mr Winninger: I would certainly concur with Ms O'Neill, if we can extend the time to this gentleman. He appeared to have a written brief. He appeared to want to present that to us and hopefully another 15 minutes would suffice so that we can hear what he has to say. It does have to do with the future of our children. It is obviously a very important issue and, time constraints permitting, I think I would ask that he be allowed to do that and that we bend the rules again to allow that to happen.

The Chair: Time constraints do not allow, but if the members of the committee wish to do it, understanding fully the implications of doing that, certainly as the Chair I will respect that wish of the committee. Mr Beady, would you be prepared to come forward and take up another 15 minutes to give us your views?

Mr Beady: I would have to water down my presentation if I locked myself into the 15-minute time frame and I am afraid that the impact of the presentation would not have the impact that I had wanted.

The Chair: Right. Well then, Mr Beady, I hope that you will take the opportunity to send us your presentation.

KEN BOLTON

The Chair: I call Ken Bolton in next.

Mr Bolton: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the select committee. I would also like to say meegwetich to Frank for the integrity of saying it the way it is, because as Canadians we have a nasty habit of being so damned nice and polite and, like Frank, I was so disappointed when I walked in today, not having seen this document, to be told that we were allowed 15 minutes to talk about the future of our nation. Well, Andy Warhol only promised us 15 minutes each, so I suppose that is fair.

I have been talking about Canada and my love of this country and my concerns about this country for 47 years and I am not going to stop. I will stop at 15 minutes today, if those are the rules.

I would like, first of all, to introduce myself. My name is Ken Bolton. I am speaking as an individual. I was born in the province of Quebec. I have lived in eight provinces and one territory, and 10 days from now I will become a resident of the Yukon, the other territory that I have not lived in yet, so I know a bit about Canada and I know a bit about politics, and in 15 minutes I can only give you some snapshots of what Canada means to me.

I would like to use as the first snapshot some things that I saw in this briefing paper, this discussion paper that I just received a few minutes ago. I would refer you to page 25, which is the tear-out mailer. I am absolutely delighted that you are providing copies of this discussion paper in English, Italian, Chinese, French, Portuguese, Spanish and Greek. May I ask about Oji-Cree, or Cree or Ojibway? May I ask, since verbal presentations are only 15 minutes long, why we are only allocated eight lines in which to write our feelings and thoughts about our nation?

I would refer you to page 11 of this document, to the marginal note written or uttered on 10 August 1990 by the former Premier of Ontario: "I believe in Canada not only as an economic and political unit, but as the best expres-

sion of the type of caring and compassionate society that has served Canadians well for the past 123 years." Have we forgotten the fact that on the day those words were uttered, Canadian troops were deployed against the aboriginal people of this country at Kanesatake? Have we forgotten that? Is that the kind of compassionate society that Canada has become?

1720

I would also like to suggest that if you would turn to page 17, the references to the Robarts-Pépin report and the six distinctive features of modern Quebec society which that committee found, for the word "Quebec" or the word "French" would you substitute the words "Anishnabwe" or "Nishnawbe-Aski." The six distinctive features of modern Nishnawbe-Aski society or modern aboriginal society in Canada surely include history; predominance of language, if it is allowed to be preserved; civil as well as common law, which existed before we came and said, "Ours is better; yours has to go"; the common ethnic origin of a majority of its population; the shared desires, aspirations and even fears of that nation's population, and the unique role that politics and—I will substitute "Ontario, federal and indigenous governments"—play in shaping that society.

If you were to look at that statement within that context, I think perhaps there might be the subject for a meaningful second visit by this committee specifically to the area north of here to talk directly with the Anishnabwe people.

I said earlier that I would talk in some snapshots. I said that I was born in Quebec. When I was a kid on the streets of Verdun, language was not a problem. I just knew that Jean Richard spoke a little bit differently than I did. We understood each other. He might have called it "patate" and I called it "potato." The thing that distinguished Jean Richard from the rest of us was that Jean Richard had a nasty habit of eating worms. Now, that has nothing to do with his cultural or ethnic background; he was just the kid who ate worms. We never thought, "He is the kid who talks that other language," because we did not know from language. What did we know? We did not know we spoke English; how the hell were we supposed to know he spoke French?

We did have certain assumptions back in 1943 about what our country was, though. We knew that it was a British colony. Well, forget the Balfour declaration and the Statute of Westminster. We knew we were a British colony; you could tell when the flags went out. We knew that there was a good party on Dominion Day or Victoria Day. We knew there was a hell of a lot better party on Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day because that was, after all, Quebec.

Then later I was a student and would-be politician in London, Ontario, and I got a new picture of what Canada was. It was a large, heterogeneous society in which people of the stamp of John Parmenter Robarts took care of us all. They made sure that the business got done and that the country stayed together and we were all one big, loving, happy family.

Then I grew up and left London, or maybe it was the other way around, and I started to travel this country more and I began to realize more and more that I had been sold a

bill of goods about what this country was and what this country could be and what this country must be. I had been lied to by my history textbooks. For example, I was told that Louis Riel was a traitor. No, no. Louis Riel is not an aboriginal hero; Louis Riel is a Canadian hero. I was told a whole lot of other things too and, more significantly, not told a lot of other things.

It is only by travelling this country and living in every corner of it that I have begun to realize what this place is. What has happened in the last decade appals me because what has happened is that this country has been taken over by a kind of mindset that says a nation can be brought down to things such as GNP, PNP, amending formulas, transfer payment formulas and all that.

I say, "Bullshit." This country is about people. It is about people like Aeneas and Ursula Cody, in Lot 65 of Prince Edward Island; it is about people like Léandre Bergeron in Quebec; it is about people like John B. and Isobel Moose from South Indian Lake, Manitoba, or George Blondin from Denendeh—people who do not think about Canada, but who feel Canada and who care about what this country is, represents and does.

Since no country can exist without leaders or without heroes, I would like to suggest that the crisis in which we find ourselves today is largely as a result of the lack of leadership and the lack of direction being provided at all levels of government. The sound you heard at 3:30 when the bell rang and those students left the auditorium was not just the sound of students walking out after class; it was the sound of chickens coming home to roost.

Our structure has not allowed the majority of Canadians to feel that they are part of the process, that they are meaningful and strong and empowered. Every one of us who has ever been involved in politics or aspired to be involved in politics or, as I have been, involved in media, who has failed to deliver that message over and over again, "It ain't our country to run on your behalf; it's your country, help us do it right," every one of us who has failed to give that message to the Canadian people has failed Canada and failed my children, Frank's children and grandchildren, and every single person in this country. We have to get it back, folks. We have to get it back.

I do not care if Quebec leaves. Let me put a caveat on that. I care very much if Quebec leaves, but far more important to me than the question of whether we are 10 provinces and two territories or nine provinces and a couple of new ones in the works or whatever is that the people of this country have a right to self-determination wherever they live. If it is the will of the people of Quebec to live under a different political system, so be it, God bless them. Let's sit down and make it an amicable divorce, because I know from experience the other kind of divorce leaves too many scars.

I am not too worried about whether Quebec separates or not, but I am very, very concerned about the kind of Canada that we have right now, the kind of Canada towards which we seem to be drifting. We have a kind of leadership, particularly at the federal level, that displays a kind of arrogance towards the Canadian people that has not been seen since Clarence Decatur Howe.

I know it is very popular to do fed-bashing. It is easy to kick a man when he is down to 12%. But we have a crisis in this country, not the crisis about Quebec or about language. We have a crisis of will, a crisis of leadership. The current Prime Minister has started a process of abrogating the responsibility of a federal government, saying, "Well, we'll allow"—they are now called first ministers, pardon me. They were premiers at one point, which was a perfectly serviceable and bilingual word. We are now allowing the premiers to set the agenda for the nation on national issues. That is wrong. I did not help elect the Premier of Ontario to run the federal government. I vote for federal politicians to do their duties at the federal level.

We have to get back to this process of saying, "Hey, no offence, guys, but we're going to have to work some things out here." But we are not just saying, "Hey, you guys in the club can sit down and have a little discussion about how you are going to carve it up." To me, that is sort of like a scene play—let's call it the Meech Lake Mafiosi—where 12 people, 12 dons, sit down and decide how they are going to carve up the territory.

They say, "You can have the girls and the pinball machines, but you ain't getting the numbers or the cocaine," or "You can have the cocaine but we want the cocaine and the girls and the numbers." Unfortunately, that is about what we had last year during the Meech Lake accord. We, as Canadians, let it happen because we were not vigilant, we were not politicized, we opted out of the process. I am not blaming you as politicians. Most of you are new to the Legislature anyway, so I cannot blame you. But we, as Canadians, failed to do it. Our leadership did not help us get there.

Enough of that.

The Chair: Mr Bolton, if you can sum up.

Mr Bolton: Am I about out of time?

What happened as a result of the Meech Lake accord we all know and that is where heroism came in. Two men had the guts to say no with dignity and respect and love for this country. Elijah Harper for his reasons and Clyde Wells for his reasons said: "No, this is not the way we do things in Canada. It is not the way we guarantee justice and equality and all the things that Canada is about ineffably." I am proud, as a Canadian, that there are still two people left. I hope you will flush out many, many more around Ontario as you go doing your hearings.

Do you have a couple of questions? I will give you very quickly a couple of answers to questions you have asked. About the role Ontario should play: It is not the role of kindly uncle taking care of business or the role of would-be senior statesman; it is the role of the honest broker who loves this country and who says to the people of Cape Breton, "You are just as important as the people of Hamilton Mountain," who says to the people of Sioux Lookout, "Your aspirations are just as valid as those of the people of Eckville, Alberta."

Ontario can be that honest broker and provide the kind of moral leadership and integrity that has gone missing. I challenge you to do it, I urge you to do it. My country is in the balance and so is yours. Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Bolton. We are not going to have time for questions.

1730

WAWATAY COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair: I just checked with Lawrence Martin from the Wawatay Communications Network and with the concurrence of the committee, what I would like to suggest is that we take a bit of time and go to the telephone lines and then come back. There are three other people who wish to speak. Is that agreeable? Mr Martin is going to make some opening comments and then we will go to the telephone lines.

Mr Martin: Thank you very much. I wanted to get a chance to squeeze in this time to be able to allow the people who have been waiting very patiently from the northern communities to call in and to address what is happening here. They have been calling ever since you guys have been on from 3 o'clock. The last few days we have been plugging you, saying that you are coming here. This has built up a lot of expectations. So I thought it would be quite appropriate now if we can actually start taking those calls.

There are a number of them and, again, it is basically the same thing. We do not have enough time. Let's try to do as much as we can. Also, keep in mind that Wawatay is a native communications society providing information and providing these kinds of communication services to the north. It is very important that the people actually try to speak, because we understand that there is not going to be an opportunity for the native people to speak themselves here, because the committee will not be going to the native communities up north. With that, I would like to start asking the people to call in.

[Remarks in native language]

Mr Martin: I realize that the people are always in support of what Wawatay is doing because the people themselves have been building Wawatay over the last 14, 15 years.

Here is one call already. It must be one of our best supporters. It just goes to show how important this communication system is. If we can get that call over the air, you should be able to hear it and the translation can then begin on that. I guess it is probably a Cree caller coming, so I will have to do a translation:

"Hi, this is Sarah Melvin. I am calling from Sachigo, Ontario. I suppose you do not know where Sachigo is. Anyway, I have a question for the select committee. I am very, very disappointed that they did not come to the northern communities. I am on the verge of crying and choking on my words because of how disgusted I am with the select committee that is making a tour across Ontario.

"The reason behind it is because these politicians think they know what the native people want in the northern communities. My question is, why did they not come to the northern communities? If they did come to the northern communities, I do not think they would have heard our voice because we have not been listened to for a long, long time. I do not want any excuses from these politicians. I

want to know the real truth why you did not come to the northern communities."

The Chair: I am going to comment on that, but one of our members, the Vice-Chair of the committee, wants to comment first.

Mr Bisson: What people need to understand about the process here is that typically what happens with either select committees or committees in general when they tour across the province is that they are limited to a time schedule to be able to go to some of the communities in order to hear what the representations of the people are. One of the things that this committee set out to do from the very beginning is to try to address as many people as we can, to get people to come before this committee in as many places as was possible within the province of Ontario.

Now, there are a few firsts that happened in this committee. I take a lot of pride on the part of the committee for it. This is the first committee ever to travel across the province of Ontario where we are televising the proceedings on an instantaneous basis across the province. One of the reasons that the subcommittee and the committee in general decided to do this was to give everybody an opportunity to listen in to what was happening, so people were able to have an opportunity to start formulating some of their own views.

The other thing happening right now is that we recognize there are many, many communities in northern Ontario, and in southern Ontario for that matter, that would like to have an opportunity to have the committee in their community. Unfortunately, we would have to sit for the next three or four years to be able to do that. The province is very big. There are very many communities. So we opened it up through technology to the telephones, to other types of media that are possible to allow as much input as possible.

I would like to address one question in regard to the 15 or 30 minutes. Again, it is a time-lines consideration. I understand what people are saying. But the reality is that we need to have a format because a number of people want to appear before the committee. If we do not structure it in such a way, people will not have the opportunity to do so.

The other thing that I would add is that obviously we are becoming much more conscious as we travel around the province about the different perceptions and the different feelings that exist and realizing as we travel across that there are always going to be communities and there certainly have been communities that feel left out of the process. Part of our challenge is going to be how we can remedy that in the future.

I would like to take the opportunity to ask you if you have, in addition to the concerns about the process that you have expressed, any other comments that you wish to make to us about the kinds of issues that we are discussing. No? Thank you.

1740

The Chair: Let's take another call.

Mr Martin: If I can just translate, this is Emile Nakogee from Attawapiskat, Ontario, up in James Bay.

First of all, he is sending greetings to everybody who is here on the committee and he is happy that you are in the vicinity of the native communities and you are trying your best to focus some of the discussions towards the native people in this area.

He is thinking about a lot of things as the meeting is going on, as he listens to the radio signal. He is thinking about the war overseas and how the Canadian government has committed his people to that and not really made them fully aware of what the complications could be and also not taken the full responsibility of how that kind of commitment to the coalition he is referring to will have an impact on the people here in Canada.

He is also thinking about the effect now trapping is going to be going through because you probably heard about how the Hudson's Bay Co is now not buying any more furs and how for so many years the native people depended on this for the fur sales. They were also the ones who were responsible for making the Hudson's Bay Co such a big company as it is today.

He is also thinking about how good it is to be able to hear what is going on, even though he is so far away from here. He is happy that there is Wawatay Communications to provide this signal to him. The signal is clear and the translators who are providing translation from the floor are making the wording that everybody is saying very clear so he is able to understand everything that is being said.

He is also wondering if it would be at all possible for the government to try to deal with some of these native issues over a certain length of time instead of trying to deal with so many things all at once. He is suggesting, let's try for one month to talk about all the different things that we have to talk about as native people and government.

He is also very sorry that there is not enough time to go and deal with these kinds of things, that we can only touch upon them a very little. Mr Chairman, he wants to thank you for providing this opportunity for him to be able to provide this information to you. He is asking that you think about him, that you think about the people in James Bay as you progress in this work you are doing.

The Chair: Mr Martin, maybe we could clarify. Is it possible for there to be any questions asked and answered back? I do not know if the person is still on the line.

Mr Martin: The problem is that they realize that there are so many other people who want to speak to you that they are trying to get off as quickly as possible.

The Chair: I do not know if that gentleman is still on the line.

Mr Martin: He is off it now.

The Chair: All right. We will just thank you for his comments then. We will carry on. Is there another call?

Ms O'Connor: This is Shirley O'Connor. I am a local resident here in Sioux Lookout, and I have been listening to the comments and to the presentations. I would like to commend Bob Rae for providing this opportunity to hear how we as Canadians are going to mould Canada.

Given the political beast we operate around currently, is it not possible—I am sure a lot of you sitting around the table are sensitive enough to the fact that time is of the

essence, time does not allow us to have the full impact we want. One of the things I thought of, sitting there, was that as the isolated north again is going to be left out—I for one only heard about this very recently, which did not give me time to prepare to present to you my thoughts as to what Canada should look like—I wonder if Wawatay could travel with the select committee in providing more information to northern Ontario. I think that is one way we collectively can reach northern Ontario, and hopefully do an adequate job or at least attempt to do it in that process, in reaching all of our people we hope to reach. That was one comment I wanted to make.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We can take a look at that suggestion to see whether it is a possibility. If you want to just stay on the air, there are two quick comments or questions.

Ms Harrington: I want to respond by saying this. I am looking at how much there is north of Sioux Lookout. Looking at this map and realizing the broadcast north of here and that this is actually the connection between the south and the north, I think it is very important for us to be here to know that and the importance of this service from here to the north.

I wanted to say to the women who are north of Sioux Lookout that we as new women in government want to have closer connections with you north of here. I also want to say that I understand some of the resentments and the concerns that have been voiced in the last half-hour or so, because we came into government—all of us on this side are new; we have a new New Democratic government—and we found that the country is drifting and we are in a state of crisis.

We have a great responsibility here in Ontario, and we have to take that very seriously. We are starting, we are trying, and we want to work with you. We have not the answers yet, but we are looking to you to try and help us with some of those answers.

Mr Beer: Briefly, to the caller and also the question of improving our ability to communicate, if Wawatay is really the only non-governmental group that uses the parliamentary channel for its regular programming, I wonder if we might explore with Wawatay the possibility of another phone-in or perhaps a couple of phone-in shows whereby we could reach that area and have this kind of communication with the committee. This could happen later on in the process to ensure that more people could participate, because I think this kind of contact is very good. If I am right, some of those links through Wawatay to these communities are there and we could make better use of that.

The Chair: That is something we can take a look at. Thank you very much for calling.

Mr Martin: As you can see, there are a lot of callers trying to reach the committee. It is important, and I understand what some of them have been saying to me before I got on here: Is it possible for the committee to take a look at making another trip, or when you are in another northern community like Timmins is it possible for you to go into a native community nearby? They definitely have a lot

of issues that need to be talked about, and this is one of the requests I am getting.

The Chair: I think it would be fair to say at this point that our schedule for the rest of the month is fixed. To the best of our ability, we are not able to make any changes to that, but as we have indicated, there are at least two things.

One is the comment Mr Beer made about whether, as part of our stop in any of those communities—Timmins may very well be a good example of a place where we could take a look at again providing through Wawatay a hookup so that people could phone in, at least have that possibility.

Second, as we do the second stage of our work I think we will have to take a look at this whole question of how we most effectively communicate with people across the province. Obviously, the north and native communities in the north are going to have to be an area we pay a little more attention to.

Mr Martin: It is also important to keep in mind that, as much as Wawatay wants to participate in this information link with the native people in northern communities, we also have had to sacrifice the high school courses we are offering on the radio network so that this committee can be heard in northern communities. For us to continue working with the committee on that basis, it would have to be during the day, when we do not have to get rid of the high school courses during that time, because that is very important too.

The Chair: I presume we would have to look at some evening times in order to avoid that conflict?

Mr Martin: You would have to be looking at Saturdays and Sundays.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr Martin: We have another caller.

Mr Beardy: For the benefit of the committee, Moses Anderson is one of our leading elders, who has worked with the development of Indian government institutions within the Nishnawbe-Aski nation. I hope I can do justice in translating most of what he has said. He said:

"My name is Moses Anderson from Kasabonika. The native people know who their Creator is. All peoples must not lose what was given to them by the Creator. Laws were passed down to us for many generations on how we should live together and how we should work with each other. The native people are not totally compatible with many of the ways the white man does things. We have our own way of doing things and the white man has his own way of doing things. Sometimes those ways are not compatible. We, the native people, prospered from the gifts we received from the Creator. We should always look for ways of how our people can start carrying their own affairs. The first nations people have certain inherent rights that were given to them by the Creator and no government on earth can take those rights away from them."

Moses Anderson from Kasabonika hung up after he spoke.

1800

The Chair: Thank you very much. Do we have another call?

Mr Martin: We have a lot of technology, but it is not yet refined.

The Chair: Not everything co-operates when you want it to. Is there a call we are trying to put through?

Mr Martin: There are two calls on hold now. That was Flora Kate from Sachigo. We are going to ask Flora to call back, try again. We also had another call from Constance Lake, Mathew Sutherland. This is a call coming in from Constance Lake near Hearst.

Mr Sutherland: Can you speak a little louder?

The Chair: We can hear you. Go ahead.

Mr Sutherland: I cannot hear very much. I am Mathew Sutherland over here speaking from Calstock. I have been involved with the government about 10 years, with the federal government, and tried to convince it that we have a right to live the Indian people's life. I worked with the NDP during the election time in the past year. Also, I even tried now to get in touch with the provincial at this time.

Then I hope, myself, if I have time to speak what I have in my knowledge concerning the life of the Indian people, I would like very much to address myself right and express myself right in a proper way, but at this time the time is too short and the time also is very rationed. So I will say, myself, one thing: The history cannot repeat one more time, just like in the days of the James Bay treaty, Treaty 9, what happened during the year of 1905 and 1906.

At that time the people did not realize what hold in the future, but today, ourselves as educated youths and the people, they know much better today what they are going to answer to the white leaders in the government. Then we have a way ourselves as an Indian people how we are going to survive. This is what I would like to express, but time is too short.

As far as I know myself, we cannot look to what we were living like in the past for the future. For the future likely will be different. Just like a settlement, just like a town, similar to those things, say, "What does 'civilized' mean?" In that way, when the time comes to be very hard for this in our lives, and this way, I believe, is the one we have to accept.

I would like to mention also other things which are very important, but to me over here—I am sitting over here in the Hearst area and I have a chance to speak up with the MPPs who are sitting over in Kapuskasing. Maybe I could hold a meeting and then I could discuss fully what I have in my position.

[Remarks in Oji-Cree]

1810

Mr Martin: I can just summarize what Mathew has said in the last part. You heard a chuckle from the people here because he said: "I am going to address my Cree and Oji-Cree speech now to the native people. You are probably wondering what I am trying to say in my broken English." This is where the chuckle came from. However, he

is saying that as to the things he himself is trying to pass on to the young people, the traditional lifestyles; it has become harder and harder to do that. It seems like he too is running out of time, just as we are running out of time here to discuss these things properly.

He realizes at the same time that he cannot live in the old ways and must try to change and adapt to what is happening today, because that is what is happening in the rest of the world. At the same time, we cannot let go. We cannot just let things pass. We just cannot let these influences keep on causing us to change our ways. We must try to hang on to them as much as we can. He realizes that there has to be this interaction between the native people and their lifestyles in trying to maintain their culture, that there has to be interaction between the provincial and the federal governments, that they are responsible and that they have to be part of trying to keep the native culture intact, where it was before.

There has to be this time set aside to be able to talk about these certain things and to be able to plan them. He knows that it is going to be a hard way, a hard thing to try to do, but that process must begin, and as he said earlier we must not let history repeat itself in the bad way that it has been going on for some time.

Lastly, he is sending his greetings to every one of you and hopefully he can meet with some other members in his area, in the Hearst area soon.

That was Mathew Sutherland from Constance Lake. I just want to point out to you, committee members, that there are three different languages that are coming in—Oji-Cree, Ojibway and Coastal Cree—and now there is also a mixture of the Cree and the Oji-Cree from Constance Lake so there is getting to be a real moving around with the different dialects and the different languages. What we are going to attempt to do now is we are going to have one of our translators so you can pick up the Oji-Cree version that is coming in. It is going to be translated simultaneously into English.

Mr Bisson: This is a first as well, yes.

Mr Martin: This is a first and the first one who is going to do it is Ennis Fiddler from Sandy Lake. He is a translator.

[Remarks in Oji-Cree]

1820

Mr Martin: We have one more caller from Lansdowne House.

The Chair: I think we will conclude with that call and then go back to the list of speakers.

Mr Martin: If I may just remind the committee, part of the problem of why we are having with such a bad telephone signal is the telephone systems in the north. It is 1991 but we are still not there as far as proper communication systems go. These are these kinds of difficulties we always face, so I think it is one of those kinds of issues where development has to happen across the country, not only in southern Ontario or in places where votes are or where everything else is.

That also has been affecting our distance education delivery because of these kinds of communication systems

not being properly in place, not properly being able to have them run effectively at all times.

We have a caller now. Okay, we will get on with this last caller and then take it back to you.

[Remarks in Oji-Cree]

1830

The Chair: We thank him too. Thank you very much.

Mr Martin: We have one final call. This is a chief from Webequie. He has been calling a few times, so I would like to at least give him this opportunity.

The Chair: Sure. Let's do that.

Mr Martin: So the best translator in the house, Ennis Fiddler, if you could try one more time, please. Okay. Put him over the air.

Chief Spence: [Remarks in Ojibway]

The Chair: Thank you, sir, for your comments.

Mr Martin: I would just like to say thank you for the opportunity to be able to work together, to be able to provide this kind of information to the very northern communities. I hope that the future will be bright for all of us, that the world will not come to a very disastrous position. We are all very afraid, of course, and the likes of Wawatay communications in providing these kinds of services is very important to the people, as you can see. I hope that the support will always be there for all of us to be able to work together in the future.

Meegwetch.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Martin, for this opportunity for us to hear from some of the residents of the communities outside of Sioux Lookout through the Wawatay communications network. I guess I would say that if there is any opportunity that you have over the next days and weeks in your programming as you gather comments, as I am sure you do, on an ongoing basis from your listeners, we would be happy to hear any of those comments if you were able to pass those on to us. I think in addition to the commitment we gave to explore what other kinds of additional ways we can pursue with this communication network and link, we certainly would be delighted to have any additional input from you and from Wawatay or any comments that come through to you. That would be useful for us. Thank you very much.

We will resume then with the list of the deputants that we have remaining who are present with us. There are three people. Just for the members of the committee and the public, I realize that we are running over the time we had allotted, but I think that circumstances are such to warrant that. My understanding is that the three presentations should not be that long. We will do our best to end as soon as we can. Mr Moroz.

1840

THOMAS NEIL MOROZ

Mr Moroz: My name is Thomas Neil Moroz. I am a Canadian citizen. I have been interested in politics since I was about 13 years of age. I would like to begin by extending greetings to each and every one of you, ladies and gentlemen, of this government committee on this happy

day of 5 February 1991 here in Sioux Lookout under the sun. On behalf of all the citizens of this community and myself, I welcome you. I do hope that this hearing has not been too intense for you people to bear.

In consideration of all that has transpired here this afternoon to evening, because evening it now is, I would like to put you at ease, for I am here to state an opinion not necessarily shared by any other individuals. I am not here to keep or to score political points, as some previous speakers chose to do instead of speak. They decided to ruffle feathers. First off, I do believe that the public notice of this committee's appearance was slight. I found out myself through Ken Bolton over a cup of coffee just last evening. I do not know what the reasons are for this, but I did manage to get wind of it and here I am.

I am here to state, in my opinion, what I believe Ontario's role should be in the Confederation of Canada. Ontario's role, under the new government and leadership of New Democratic Party is the golden opportunity to lead this country or could be the golden opportunity to form a unified nation. One people under one flag with one spirit that we can call Canada, no matter where your family blood comes from. It is also time to convince the people of Quebec to lay down their differences and be harmonious, until this country becomes a nation, with a Constitution to stand together for ever and to reject the Canada-US free trade manoeuvres, until all of the aboriginal first nations' claims have been resolved to every last Canadian's satisfaction, before this essence we call Canada has been lost to history and all is lost to the so-called neighbours to the south, whom I choose to call Uncle Scam. For as Canadians, united we shall stand, divided we will fall.

In conclusion, I would love to extend my compliments to all of you, each and every one of you individually, for your efforts here today and to thank you sincerely from the bottom of my heart for this privilege, for this moment in the history of Ontario. For Canada, I thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Moroz. Are there any questions? Okay.

Mr Moroz: Meegwetch.

GREG HLADY

The Chair: Next is Greg Hlady.

Mr Hlady: Thank you, Mr Chairman. I only realized that this hearing was being held about an hour ago, so I have not really had time to make much of a presentation, but I did want to bring a concept to the committee and I have a bit of a preamble to it.

As I grew up I was led to believe that we live in a democracy and I cherished that idea, but as I experienced the reality of life in Canada, I found that we do not live in a democracy. We live in a society dominated by special interests, by power brokers and by divisive partisan power structures which preclude participation by ordinary people in communities.

This type of special-interest-oriented government ultimately results in a flow of capital out of our communities, biological capital in the form of our natural renewable resources, monetary capital which is used to promote centralized development and intellectual capital in the form of

our youth and our bright minds that have no opportunities here in our communities. Our communities here and across the country are being impoverished by this outdated and inappropriate form of government.

In my view, true democracy and a just society must be constructed from the ground up, from the individual and community level. Local control over resources and policy-making is central to establishing a true participatory democracy. Ultimately, if we are to build a fair and just society, we must provide a framework and process for individuals and communities to express themselves and to define their communities according to their own values. Only through such a process will the needs of all individuals and communities be achieved.

I have been working with a group called PINE, which stands for People Interested in a Natural Environment. While we are generally oriented around maintenance of a sustainable environment, we recognize that the economy and development are inseparable elements of that environment and that they must be considered and have a place in that process. What we have done, and it is still in the conceptual stages, is developed a process which we call CREED.

The word "creed" is defined as a formulation of principles, rules, opinions and precepts formally expressed and seriously adhered to and maintained. The Citizens' Roundtable on the Environment, Economy and Development, whose acronym is CREED, is a proposed process of consensus-building and decision-making within each community actuated through a public participation process involving the public and various social, economic, health and environmental and cultural and governmental sectors of the community.

The primary participants in the CREED process are the local citizens of the community. The CREED process is a participatory democratic process intended to ensure a balanced and informed representation of the various sectoral interests within the community. The process is intended to pre-empt confrontation between these sectors and to encourage a co-operative channelling of energy to benefit the community at large. The CREED structure consists of a number of sectoral roundtables which will be mandated to formulate positions representative of their respective constituencies within the community.

I would ask each of you just to envision yourselves as being a member of one community, sitting around a roundtable much like we are right now, and rather than representing different special interests, you might represent education, health, social services, environment, youth, elders, industry, agriculture, tourism, community service organizations, culture, church and local government.

1850

In addition, a number of other seats would exist around the table which would participate as non-voting seats, and these would include the provincial and federal governments, the press and electronic media and development proponents. Imagine each of you representing the interests that emerge through the concerns expressed in the community and a secretary of each of those areas being democratically appointed which could express the views of that

constituency. Imagine coming together in a forum like this and tabling resolutions as we go back to the original definition of "creed": principles, precepts, opinions and rules which are relevant to the community's own development.

Once that is done, once those principles are articulated in a non-confrontational manner, then out of that body of community values can be developed a mandate, an authority and a process by which those values can be expressed and translated into resolutions, judgements, decrees, advisories, opinions, rules. Out of those resolutions and out of that body of wisdom, let's say, management and operating regimes could be developed, administrative structures and programs could be developed which could be applied to community planning, community resource control development, environmental concerns, socioeconomic issues, and through that process the real values of the community could be expressed and could be realized over time.

This concept is just that. It takes people to make it real. It takes people to define it and to make it work, and it also takes support from the people who now hold the authority, such as the provincial government over natural resources, the federal government over, say, native affairs, and many of the resources which should rightfully belong to the local control of native peoples and other groups which may hold that authority.

It is really a prerequisite that there is a management structure in place and that there is a credible body to administer authority before authority is transferred, and I think that this is a process that we are proposing. It is something that will take time to mature and it will only mature if people want to take ownership in each of those respective sectors that I have mentioned. It is a process and a framework which we are proposing, but at this point in time it is nothing more than that.

My feeling is that if we are really going to create a truly just society, we have to find a process and framework that can satisfy the needs of people, the people I have been listening to today who have felt that they have not had a voice in policy-making. They have not been heard, nobody has the time to listen, and really we should be the ones in this community who are sitting around this table and deciding what is good for this community. We should be taking back that authority that we do not presently have.

I would like to leave you with that, unless any of you have any questions, which I would be glad to answer.

Ms Harrington: Mr Hlady, I want to thank you for coming. You certainly have given us a very detailed presentation, which we certainly cannot understand in a matter of 10 or 12 minutes. But you mention the group that you belong to called PINE. Is that just in Sioux Lookout?

Mr Hlady: That is in the Sioux Lookout area.

Ms Harrington: How many members do you have?

Mr Hlady: Last year, the Ministry of Natural Resources proposed spraying herbicides in this area, and PINE originated from the concerns that came from people who felt they would be adversely affected by that program. I think that we can honestly say that there is a very substantial body from within the communities. Through the summer many different sectors of the community came

together and decided that was a program that we did not feel was appropriate for our community.

The town of Sioux Lookout passed a resolution, with the support of a good deal of the population of this town, to support alternatives to that type of approach, alternatives which might have other social and economic benefits as opposed to just strictly benefits to the forest industry. We were largely formed as an ad hoc group and we like to feel that anybody can be a person interested in a natural environment. We feel we have a very large membership.

Ms Harrington: It is great to have grass-roots organizations like that. I would like to tell you that there are very many in our government who share your types of concerns. I think you may be aware of that. We have an environmental group from my riding. My colleague Marilyn Churley is with the Ministry of the Environment and has very many concerns similar to yours. So I want to reassure you that we are very much open to any of your suggestions.

You may want to give some of the detailed notes, if you wish, to our Chair. I also just want to touch on your mention of special interest with regard to government. I am not sure exactly of your meaning, but I do want to reassure you that I am a newly elected person, representing the city of Niagara Falls, and my feeling is that I have to speak for every one of my constituents, whoever they are. I have to know whether I am speaking for the tourism industry, the unemployed, the single mother, the youth, the seniors. I have to go out into that community and really know that community. I would like to think that I represent not any special interest at all.

Mr Hlady: Could I ask you if you would feel it beneficial if there were a sectoral roundtable within your community representing each of those constituencies that would express its view in a collective manner? Do you think that would assist you in making sound decisions, based on your total constituency?

Ms Harrington: Certainly that would be very, very helpful. Previous to September, I was a member of city council and I went to the chamber of commerce, I sat on the YWCA, the social planning council and all those different groups, so instead of my going to those groups and finding out what was happening, they would then sit on this council. That would be fine.

Mr Beer: My questions were somewhat along the same lines and, just briefly, one other thing. I think one of the things that probably all of us in politics today have been trying to sort out is how we can better have a sense of what people are thinking in our community and what other ways we can approach consensus-building.

I think that is one of the key things you have set out. I could see from here in the diagram that you had a process which I think, along with perhaps others—but none the less, where you are trying to bring together different interests within our communities. If at some point your group here puts that together in some kind of printed form, I think it would be very interesting to look at.

The only other point that I would make and to which you might want to respond is, I think still ultimately,

whatever kinds of consensus-building model, or whatever we want to call it, we put together, at the end of the day an individual member in a sense has to take that and try to think, "Has that represented adequately the interests of my community?" I think sometimes there are other people who would say, "But I don't belong to any of those particular interests, or I don't see that I do, so how do I become involved?" Sometimes we will simply say, "Look, the only sort of role that I play is in electing my city councillor or my school board member or my provincial member, my federal member or what have you." I do not think that takes away or detracts at all from what you are searching for there. I would see that as a great help, as a model in helping us do our work.

Mr Hlady: One of the seats that I did not mention was a seat that is generically called "the public," and as part of that seat it is actually this table here where I am able to come up and express my views, but at the same time it is a process integrated into this concept which allows a number of us public to get together, and through a plebiscite or through a petition initiate a process where we might have a plebiscite or a referendum, so that we can determine some of those issues that you might feel would not be clearly represented, and that is part of our concept.

1900

ROSIE MOSQUITO

The Chair: Our final speaker this evening is Rosie Mosquito.

Ms Mosquito: Good evening. As an aboriginal individual who is concerned about the constitutional dynamics in this country, I am here to present one point of my views. I had asked for five minutes.

I say "constitutional dynamics," but rather I guess we should call it "constitutional disarray," because this is why you are here. I am here, even though I question the haste and the constructiveness of this select committee on Ontario in Confederation. Since the demise of the Meech Lake accord, the federal and provincial governments have been scrambling to reassemble the Constitution. As we all know, Elijah Harper, the Manitoba MLA, was instrumental and was the one who catapulted the demise of the Meech Lake accord, and rightly so. I will be eternally grateful to him, as the aboriginal people in Canada share that view and non-native people in Canada share that sentiment as well.

The problematic aspect of the constitutional discussions and concerns that have occurred to date is the fallacy which the first ministers want to enshrine in the Constitution of Canada. The fallacy is the racist notion that the English and French are the founding peoples of this country. As an aboriginal descendant of this country, I find this notion totally unacceptable, repelling, hurtful and deceitful. It is time that the first ministers of this country, the English, the French and the other citizens of this country stopped deceiving themselves. It is time for the leaders, the movers and the shakers, and the citizens of this country, regardless of which province they may live in, to equate the aboriginal people at the same level as the English and

the French, if not higher. It is time the truth and this obvious fact be enshrined in the highest law of the land.

A Constitution which is built on truth, which is the acceptance and recognition of aboriginals as full and equal constitutional partners will be stable, solid and surely reflect the actual situation in Canada. If we do that together, the Constitution will be all the more meaningful to each of us and all the more powerful.

I thank you for the opportunity to be able to address you briefly at this time.

Ms Churley: I am very glad to have met you and I thank you for your presentation. I am really glad that you decided to speak to us for a few minutes, despite the shortcomings that you mentioned, and that were mentioned earlier.

I think that we, as a committee, are very grateful. I think I can speak for everybody, that we recognize the shortcomings. We recognize that this was put together hastily and that the communities where we started were shortchanged in that you had very little time to prepare.

I think the fact that even though we got yelled at a bit and we knew that was going to happen and with some justification, the fact that people are here talking to us and bothered to phone in and talk to us is really important, and I think shows to me anyway how much and the sense of urgency that people feel. Even though people are frustrated that we are here for such a short time and are not giving people very long to talk, you are here talking to us and I appreciate that. I value that.

I guess I am giving a speech. Politicians tend to do that a lot, I know, but because you are the last speaker of the night, it was really important to me to say that I learned a lot. I will continue to learn more, as we go on with our journey for the entire month of February, which I will bring back from this committee.

We hear you and I think I can speak for the committee that we are on your side. We understand to the extent that we can. We understand that this has been going on for a long time and nobody yet has done anything about it.

I guess my question is, do you have some faith? Does it just feel like it is the same old thing, politicians coming and spending a few minutes listening and then taking off and forgetting, or do you have some faith that the tone is changing a little bit, not just with the new government but people are finally starting to listen and gaining some respect for the first nations people of this country? Do you have any hope?

Ms Mosquito: As I indicated earlier, I question the sincerity and the constructiveness of this committee, but as an aboriginal person I have always had hope or my people have always had hope and that is the only reason why we are still here today despite all the odds that our ancestors faced.

Premier Bob Rae has an Indian agenda. It is an agenda that other provincial governments have not espoused, recognized or pursued, but we want more than that. We have to be enshrined within that highest law of the land. I think it would do us great service as aboriginal people if the

Premier, as one of the first ministers, ensures that we are, as aboriginal people, recognized within the Constitution.

Mr Winninger: Just to take up where you left off for a moment, I am just wondering, practically speaking, how you foresee the first nations being enshrined in the Constitution. As my colleague Ms Churley said, we are with you. We want to see native determination realized. We apologize for the format. We wanted to come to the north first because we felt the north had to be heard. In doing so, we gave you a very short period of notice. Of course there are many communities that have to be heard as well and that is why, even though we would like to spend a week here, if we spent a week here there are a lot of communities that would never be heard from.

To get back to my question, we need some practical suggestions as to how we can recognize aboriginal rights in a new model of Confederation, perhaps in a more effective fashion than has been the case in the past. Do you have any suggestions as to how, to use your words, we might enshrine that recognition in our Constitution?

Ms Mosquito: At the moment I do not have a practical suggestion to give to you. I would be more than willing to forward a written document to you, but you will find that it will not really be all that much different from what our leaders have been saying to date. We have given all levels of government position papers outlining how we could make this practical discussion that you ask.

I think the other thing that is important is that there has to be political will on the part of those people who are now in government also to have the faith and the willingness to be able to accept aboriginal people as equal partners. I think you will be surprised. You would learn a lot from us.

As I say, we have survived despite all odds. Based on that experience, if you had a willing ear you would learn a lot from us. We would be able to go far together. We would be able to all benefit in many ways—economically, culturally, socially and otherwise.

That is not rhetoric.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I would just like to say that as a member of this committee I want to thank the people for the insight that they gave us today.

I just want to respond to something you said at the end, that probably one of the best lessons I have learned with regard to understanding maybe what a Constitution was all about was from one of the elders in my own riding who said that a Constitution is something that has to be like a mirror, that when you look into it, you have to see yourself and you have to see something of what this country is all about.

I think we have a lot to learn from the first nations people of this country and of this province. I really want to thank you for the insight that you brought to this committee.

The Chair: I just take the opportunity in closing the meeting to thank all of you who came here to talk with us this afternoon and evening, and all of those who telephoned to give us their views.

I think it has been for us a fascinating afternoon and evening. We certainly leave Sioux Lookout with a better understanding of some of the things that we need to do in addressing the issues and concerns of the native communities, as well as a number of the other issues that were raised by some of the other speakers.

While the time may not have permitted us to capture all of the details that we would have liked, I think the flavour is very clearly there and I think the sense that we leave this place with is quite clear.

Before we conclude, I want to give Mr Miclash an opportunity to make some comments.

Mr Miclash: What I would like to do is I would just like to thank the committee for spending its first two days in the Kenora riding. As we know, you are moving on to Thunder Bay and to the remainder of the province. Over the last two days you have covered three significant towns in my riding, as well as having done some very interesting work with Wawatay.

There have been some suggestions that maybe you might want to use the telecommunications that Wawatay is offering you to carry on and listen to more views from that area of the riding. At this time I think we have witnessed something quite different here in connection with the people in what we call the true north, and I would encourage the members of the committee to maybe think about listening to more of that.

Again, I would just like to wish you all the very best as you head off into the rest of the province and thank you very much for allowing me to sit with this committee throughout the riding.

The Chair: Before I call on Eligah Morris for the closing prayer—I think that also is a fitting way to end this particular day—I would like to invite members of the public who are here to join us over dinner so that we can continue the discussions that have been taking place all afternoon and evening in an informal way.

[Prayer in native language]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

The committee adjourned at 1915.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 5 February 1991

Town of Dryden	C-89
John Parry	C-90
Tommy S. Jones	C-93
Dryden District Chamber of Commerce	C-96
Andrew McFayden	C-97
Jean Davis	C-100
Decade Council	C-102
Dryden Citizens Interested in Confederation	C-104
Rainy River District Community Legal Clinic	C-105
Afternoon sitting	C-109
Toivo Koivukoski	C-109
Jaqueline Rundle	C-109
Garnet Czinkota	C-112
Brian Beaton	C-114
Northern Nishnawbe Education Council	C-116
Equay Wuk (Women's Group) Inc	C-121
Frank Beardy	C-122
Ken Bolton	C-124
Wawatay Communications	C-126
Thomas Neil Moroz	C-129
Greg Hlady	C-130
Rosie Mosquito	C-132
Adjournment	C-133

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Also taking part: Miclash, Frank (Kenora L)**Clerk:** Manikel, Tannis**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



Ontario

C-6 1991

C-6 1991

ISSN 1180-4335

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 6 February 1991

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 6 février 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 6 February 1991

The committee met at 1315 at Lakehead University, Thunder Bay.

The Chair: I call this meeting to order. On behalf of the members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, I want to say how pleased we are to be in Thunder Bay today in the third day of our hearings across the province. In the two days we have spent already in this part of the province, in Kenora, Dryden and Sioux Lookout we heard a number of useful and very deeply felt feelings about this country and about the kinds of things we need to keep in mind as politicians as we proceed in our discussions. No doubt we will be having some more useful input this afternoon and this evening.

Before proceeding, I want to introduce the members of the committee. I am Tony Silipo, the Chair of the committee. From the Liberal caucus are Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus are Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick. From the NDP caucus are Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, the Vice-Chair of the committee, Margaret Harrington, Marilyn Churley, Fred Wilson and David Winninger.

I want to say to the people who are here and who are on the list to speak to us that we have one of those problems that is in some ways a pleasant problem to have but one that creates, I know, some difficulties for those people who are preparing themselves to talk with us. There has been some little confusion with the lists of people that have been submitted to us, so we have a situation where we have a longer list of people than our normal time lines would allow us to accommodate.

What I would like to do, therefore—and I apologize to the members of the public who were ready to present for doing it—is to ask people who are presenting as individuals to try to keep their presentation to within 10 minutes and groups to try to keep their presentation to within 20 minutes. I will also be a little more strict than normal in terms of the time allotted for questions from the members of the committee. If you would allow some time within your allotment for questions, that would be useful. We apologize for the problem, but it is something that, as I said, was caused because of two different lists being put together. We will try to get through it. It is not a major problem.

We also would like to say that we will be pleased, of course, to receive any additional comments that individuals who are presenting here today may have later on, or, indeed, to people who do not get a chance to talk to us today, please feel free to write to us. We are very clear in our thinking that for us this is the first stage of a discussion process that needs to continue across the province. Part of what we will be doing as we finish the hearings towards the end of February is to sit down and try to work out how best that discussion can continue and what formats will

facilitate a continuing wide discussion across the province. Certainly, if the indications from the first two days are reflective of what we will hear, there is a great deal of interest across the province, which is something that obviously is quite positive for all of us.

THUNDER BAY CENTRE OF THE DEAF

The Chair: I will begin by calling our first presenter, Denis Bergeron, from the deaf community centre in the Thunder Bay area.

Mr Bergeron: I would prefer to stand, as opposed to sitting. I want to thank all of the committee members for allowing me this opportunity to be involved in a presentation today, but I want to say at the outset that it was very frustrating to find out at the last minute that there were going to be talks on the Constitution. I do want to thank you for the opportunity to speak and for getting me on the schedule in this last-minute fashion.

I think it is important to realize that I am representing the Thunder Bay Centre of the Deaf. I am going to present a little about the values of the deaf community, issues on access, education, employment rights for deaf people and American sign language itself, which is something many of you may not understand.

I am going to ask the interpreter for a moment not to voice for me.

I wonder how many people here understood me and who had the handicap at this point. Other than Gary, I think everybody else here did. I want people to realize that and think a little bit about that. Many of you are recognizing the rights of French-language users and English-language users, which is fine, but what about people such as the native people of this country? You have not recognized their languages. They are the first people of this country. I am a Canadian. I was born and raised here. I did not immigrate to this country. I grew up here. What is my first language? It is American sign language, yet you have forced me to use my second language, English, growing up. My first language is American sign language. It is the language used by deaf people. It is the language of our community, with its own grammar and syntax, and it is something that should be recognized in the Constitution. I do not mind learning English as a second language for literacy purposes, for reading and writing. That is fine, but it is a second language. I think all of you have to see ASL as an equivalent language. I am tired of deaf people being seen as second-class citizens. We should be equal in all fashions.

1320

When we look at the issue of education it is an extremely frustrating situation. We should not have to worry about no interpreters being in the school system. We should have access to college and university whether it is a

credit or non-credit course. There is a provision that for one course per semester you are allowed to have an interpreter, but if it is a non-credit course, forget it—you do not get in at all. That is not access. I should have access to all aspects of college and university life. I expect the interpreter should be there for anything I want to access. Interpreters should be written in as a proviso in the Constitution. It should be law. It should not be something I have to fight for.

We talk about employment equity. What that really means is that deaf people cannot do things, they cannot hear. But we have that in place, and we can see. I can access things through a visual fashion. What is the difference whether I access life auditorally or through my eyes? What is the difference? There is no excuse. There should be legislation in place that stops the discrimination that is going on right now.

When we talk about accessibility, that is an extremely frustrating issue for me. Where are closed captions on TV? We do not have that in place, and do you think that what is captioned is 100% accessible? Half of the programs are not accessed. English is my second language; I do not mind using that. But why is captioning not available on all programs? I have to pay an additional price, \$400, even to get a captioning machine. They have TVs with voice in place; you just turn up the volume. Why is there not a mechanism in the TVs that allows deaf citizens to access closed captioning? It is a law in the United States. Why is it not up here?

I expect that there should be accommodation made. Equality should be a reality. But look at the phone system in this country. I cannot speak on the phone; I cannot hear. So I have to use a Tty, a device for deaf people. All you have to do is go to Bell Canada and rent a phone. I have to also pay \$250 to \$1,000 to get a Tty. That is not access. If your phone breaks down, you go to Bell Canada to replace it. If my Tty breaks down, I have to pay another \$250 to \$1,000. That is not access. Why can I not have the same access as you do? Why is there not equality?

Again, legislation should be in place that makes sure that equality is a reality, whether we have public phones in shopping malls or public centres. Why can I not pick up a public phone like everybody else? I do not want to have to go up to some hearing person and ask them if they would mind making a phone call for me. I am an independent person.

I want to emphasize the use of American sign language and how that should be recognized in the Constitution. I do not want it shoved aside, not thought about. It should be in place, period. Also, we have to make sure there is provision for interpreters. It should be law. I do not want to hear the excuses that you cannot find somebody or cannot provide somebody for me. It should be there; it should be a right.

There is a real problem with deaf people isolated in the northern regions. Northern Ontario has several deaf people, one person in a community, and we have one interpreter in the whole north. I am sure there are all kinds of deaf people isolated in various communities: 500, 1,000. How do we even know how many deaf people are out

there, one person in a small community? There are no senior citizens' homes that provide services for deaf or hard-of-hearing people. There is nothing in place for seniors. There are no group homes for deaf or hard-of-hearing people in the north, nothing that makes sure that services are provided, no education for these people. They are in the dark ages. They are hidden away some place. We have to make sure that these people are provided with the services they need.

I want to thank you for allowing me to come here, and I hope you do take stock of what I said.

Mr Malkowski: I want to thank you very much for having the courage to come here today and speak to us and raise these concerns. You are saying that you would like to make sure that interpreters are a right in court systems, in education, in colleges and universities. You feel that should be recognized in the Constitution. Not only ASL, but what about langue des signes québécoise?

Mr Bergeron: Yes, definitely, LSQ also has to be recognized. For example, my parents' first language is French. Their second language is English. Both of them speak both languages well, they are bilingual. But I think LSQ also should be in the Constitution. That should be provided for also.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

MIDWIFERY TASK FORCE OF ONTARIO, THUNDER BAY CHAPTER

The Chair: I call next Darlene Reid from the Midwifery Task Force of Ontario, Thunder Bay chapter.

Ms Reid: My name is Darlene Reid. I am here as a representative of the Thunder Bay chapter of the Midwifery Task Force of Ontario, which is a consumer non-profit organization. A pamphlet of our provincial group is provided for you.

The Midwifery Task Force of Ontario follows a mandate to ensure that midwifery care is available to women and their families by: educating and informing the public about the option of midwifery care and its benefits; promoting legal status for midwifery as a self-regulating profession with multiple routes of entry; promoting accessibility of midwifery care across Ontario; and encouraging ongoing consumer input into the legislative process and the regulation of midwifery.

In addition to this, our Thunder Bay chapter espouses the following goals: to educate and inform the public about birth options, including midwifery care; to help ensure a high standard of maternity care which is responsive to and respectful of consumer needs; to promote legal status for midwifery as a self-regulating profession with multiple routes of entry and strong consumer input; to promote the accessibility of midwifery care across Ontario.

We are sure you can see that our job can be somewhat exhaustive. Our group is comprised of childbearing families and others who want to make changes in the kind of care that is currently provided to all women during the childbearing year. It is this care that is one of the important factors, if not the most important factor, that determines the health, physically, emotionally and socially, of the entire family. The health of childbearing women is swamped

by myths, routines and a dominance of male practitioners. The Midwifery Task Force of Ontario not only tries to dispel some of the myths but tries to provide the necessary input into the government and the impending legislation that can form the basis for a practice of midwifery that is responsive to consumer needs.

We feel that our provincial group speaks for the informed consumers of Ontario who need and require midwifery care. Furthermore, we feel that the facts show that midwifery care is of benefit to childbearing women and might be the only way to battle high caesarean rates and high aboriginal infant mortality rates. The underground legislative process for midwifery in Ontario has begun and we in the north feel that the regulators have been adequately taking our needs into consideration. However, the process remains too slow.

It is important to start re-examining where we spend our health care dollars. Informed consumers know that preventive and counselling programs will have more impact on how women are treated by the health care system. Midwifery is such a program, and its importance not only lies in its positive effects for a woman's health, but for newborns and families as well.

1330

We want midwifery care because it will benefit women, aboriginals and families. It needs to be self-regulating and have a positive effect on the kind of health care that women are currently receiving.

I am here only as a representative of the midwifery task force of Thunder Bay. I cannot say that I bring to you the total views of our membership. Luckily, we had a meeting scheduled for last Saturday, and we decided that an oral presentation would emphasize the importance of our concerns best. It was agreed that I should come and speak on behalf of the group and that I should present our needs and desires as best as I could based on the group's past practices and standards.

We are pleased that this select committee decided to start its meetings in northwestern Ontario, but we feel that more notice should have been given. I must make it clear to you that our group is powered by volunteers only, most of whom are mothers who work at other careers in paid or non-paid positions. This process was made aware to us last Wednesday afternoon, and then we had to chase down this discussion paper. This proved to be a challenging job, as neither office of our Thunder Bay members of Parliament had heard of it until we asked them for it. In fact, as I was walking out the door this morning, the mailman handed me my copy.

We want to publicly thank the Ontario women's directorate for making this discussion paper available to us in time to present a brief to you here today. I wonder how the consumer groups did in Kenora, as they had to present on Monday. The highway and local travel standards are questionable in this area of the province, and it is somewhat more difficult for people to get together. We have not received any input from our Kenora, Sioux Lookout or Nipigon contacts. It is our suggestion that in the future northern Ontario groups be given adequate preparation

time in order that their input can be viewed with as much strength as our southern Ontario counterparts.

I feel it is necessary to relate to you our current concerns with some of the points in the discussion paper. It is unfortunate that I cannot provide you with the exact current statistics that would make our statement more powerful. Given more time, I would have insisted on providing them, and I will try to do so at this committee's request.

Canadian women from Newfoundland to British Columbia, immigrants, aboriginals and non-natives, share bodies that can give birth. This is despite our culture, colour, language or religion. Our ability to give birth is uniquely female, yet our care in Canada is dominated by a very large majority of male care givers.

Canada is a member of the World Health Organization and the World Health Organization recognizes midwives as the international specialists in normal childbirth. Of 210 countries that belong to the World Health Organization, Canada remains one of eight that lack legislated midwifery. Our company in this regard is Venezuela, Panama, New Hebrides, El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Columbia and Burundi. Our caesarean rate ended the 1980s at about approximately 20%; locally, here, it is usually higher, without the benefit of better infant mortality statistics. Yet the World Health Organization suggests that no country can safely justify a caesarean rate of greater than 10% to 15%.

When will the Canadian system become respectful of the World Health Organization recommendations regarding normal childbirth and midwifery care? When will Canadian women be allowed midwifery with accompanying legislation that is designed to protect public interests? When will Canadian women have equal rights with women from other industrialized countries? When will Canadian women be given the right to a health care system that recognizes childbirth as a normal process rather than a disease or a medical mystery?

Midwifery can answer these questions for women positively. We need midwifery as part of our total Canadian health care. Every Canadian woman should have the right to access midwifery care.

We do not know whether women's health care or midwifery care should be a federal or provincial law, policy or practice. But what we do know is this: every Canadian woman deserves accessibility to midwifery care. If this is best achieved by federal legislation, then so be it. If this is best achieved by provincial legislation, then so be it also. However, midwifery care must reflect the culture of the area. A midwife must be able to and trained to adapt her practice to the culture of the region in which she practices.

From our experience of lobbying for midwifery legislation in Ontario, we want to express our concern with federalizing all health care. In respect to the midwifery issue, we have been fairly fortunate. Both the Midwifery Task Force of Ontario and the Interim Regulatory Council on Midwifery have been fairly respectful of our needs in the northwestern region. However, travel for the regional committee of the midwifery task force remains expensive and it is only because of their strong support for regional concerns that it continues to be funded.

The interim regulatory council has not escaped this funding problem. Their budget of the equity committee would not allow them to meet with northern women. It is this committee that was intended to determine how to make midwifery equally accessible to all of Ontario. We are concerned that they could not do their job effectively or accurately without hearing the people of northern communities on their own ground. Our group has tried to fill the gap by applying for Ontario women's directorate and Northern Development and Mines funding. We have yet to hear the results of our proposals. We may or may not get to talk to the equity committee members.

This is just indicative of the kind of problems that face our area in voicing our concerns. Travel is expensive and the approach of one person, or two, is easy to cut. We fear on a federal level that we would get lost in all the regional diversity and disparity that exists in this good country. This is so difficult for us even on a provincial scale that the problems federally may be foreseen as insurmountable. Our northwestern concerns would get represented by all of northern Ontario, whose population is even more diverse than ours is.

Our aboriginal people face similar concerns. The statistics for their maternal and early child health are shocking, yet we find it difficult to believe that their women are less capable of normal pregnancy and birth than non-natives are.

Midwifery will be a preventive program that not only watches for developments that occur outside of normal but also aids and counsels to prevent abnormal reactions from occurring. We see this as a strong benefit for aboriginal women.

We must however acknowledge our lack of information in regard to the needs of aboriginal or francophone women and midwifery care. Our knowledge of aboriginal or francophone midwifery is equally limited. However, our group has become committed to trying to obtain more insight into their needs and concerns in this area. Lack of financial means and person power is our greatest stumbling block at this time. We cannot help but believe that childbirth can be viewed as normal in their culture as well.

Northern women and aboriginal women are plagued with the reality of centralized health care. Often women from the north must travel very large distances to urban communities in order to give birth. This reality includes normal childbirth for many women as well. Women are usurped from their families, communities and cultures to the high-tech urban hospitals.

The problems with this in terms of women's self-esteem, support systems, family relationships, culture shock and finances could become a long, long list. We foresee that midwifery provided in the community as part of the community health can avoid these problems at a time when the systems and relationships are so important to the birthing woman and her newborn. This would be especially beneficial to aboriginal women, providing the midwifery care is particularly responsive to their individual needs.

As citizens of Ontario, we are proud that Ontario is close to midwifery legislation. We know that all three po-

litical parties sitting in Parliament have supported and do now support the legislation of midwifery care. We are, however, concerned with the length of time that this process is taking. When midwifery was first committed to by all three parties, we had five practising midwives in the Thunder Bay area. These dedicated women also attended women in the regional vicinity of Thunder Bay.

1340

The area of Thunder Bay is now left with no practising midwife. Many of these women left their local practice for many reasons that legislation could have prevented. Financial, political and social upheaval would have been aided or at least more easily shrugged off. These midwives may have been able to more effectively deal with the hostile political climate if the answer had not always been, "It's coming, but we don't know yet."

Statistics indicate that northern women of all kinds confront more interventions in maternity care, including caesarean section, than any other area of the province. Consumers who question maternity and women's health practices are usually considered radicals or unknowledgeable troublemakers all across Canada.

We plead with the Ontario government to recognize the benefits of midwifery care for the health of women, aboriginals and children of northern Ontario and all of Ontario. Act on this legislation now, before the north runs out of time completely and other areas become damaged as well.

I further would like to comment on the literacy level of the discussion paper. It is a document intended for the general public. I have a degree in science and some post-graduate work and I found it very difficult to wade through.

I want to apologize for providing you with my full presentation, but in the interest of time it was not preventable. Editing time was also at a minimum, so I hope that you can excuse any lack of polish.

Thank you for your ear and if there are any questions regarding provincial or federal responsibility, we would be pleased to try and locate some response.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. Certainly, if you wish, over the next days or weeks, to put together any further comments and send them to us, we would be pleased to receive them.

Mr F. Wilson: Your organization has been very effective in getting information out, at least to my office, and I would assume others also. My first child was born abroad in a system where midwives were accepted as part of the system. In fact, they were the prime players in the birthing system. My question sort of prefaces on your being a midwife yourself. Are you practising?

Ms Reid: No, I am a consumer.

Mr F. Wilson: Okay, then I will ask it anyway. Perhaps from your experience you could help us. What are the personal problems that midwives are running into in their day-to-day lives? What do they experience when they try to go about their trade or their business, briefly?

Ms Reid: I can only answer that supposing; I do not know for a fact on any, but the problems I know that

northern midwives have are financial. Because it is not legislated, a lot of people who are having normal childbirth have to pay out of their own pocket to hire a midwife, plus they still have to attend a physician, because if they do develop complications in their pregnancies, they will have to go to a hospital, in which case their primary care transfers from the midwife to the physician. So people are paying double for a service.

The other is the political climate up here. Generally, people who are involved in midwifery care or involved in trying to get the legislation are quite a bit ostracized from the rest of people.

Mr F. Wilson: That is because of their political involvement, not because they are midwives really. The feeling about midwives is not reflected—

Ms Reid: For example, if a midwife did do home births, when she does apply to be a nurse, if she is a nurse first, she gets a lot of hassle on having done home births.

Mr F. Wilson: That is the systemic aspect.

Ms Reid: Yes, that is just the way it is, and it is tough, but we really feel that legislation could deal with that problem.

JACK MASTERS

The Chair: I would call now the mayor of Thunder Bay, Jack Masters.

Mr Masters: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman, members of the committee. Monsieur le président, bienvenue à Thunder Bay à vous et à votre comité. C'est une réunion très importante, je pense.

I am happy that the committee has come to what we consider the central part of Canada, the very centre of this great nation of ours, and we are also the hub of northwestern Ontario. You have had an opportunity to hear from many of our neighbours.

I think the exercise is more than useful. I think you are receiving a great number of messages and I do not envy you the task of trying to sort out what you hear into something that will work.

But I suppose one of the main messages that all of us involved in government—and as you may know, I also had the honour of serving in the federal House for a period of time—one of the main messages that I have heard and what I have been able to catch is, we had better be listening. I think if we are not listening then we only add to the cynicism that is out there.

I also believe that we, all of us, in one form or another, through government, through societies and in our constant soul-searching, really have expounded some very basic principles constitutionally, with its difficulties, with the multicultural association. We have wonderfully kind words to say about how we are going to deal with our native population, we talk a lot about how we are going to accept one another, but somehow all of that gets lost when we try to implement it. Maybe it is because we fail to do one other thing—and this is what I would suggest that you might be looking at when all of this is over—and that is, to be pragmatic.

A clear message that I have heard just today again is alienation. One of our major problems that we have never truly addressed, and it is addressable, is the ability to know one another. If you know one another, it is a lot easier to do business.

I had a lady in my office just before lunch interviewing me, doing a survey. She had just arrived from Toronto. She was shocked to hear in Toronto from people who are well educated: "Gee, you are going to Thunder Bay. Let me see, Thunder Bay has a couple of grain elevators and it has a Zeller's Store." Beyond that, there was no knowledge of what Thunder Bay was all about. But then, here in Thunder Bay I will hear people discuss perceived housing problems and certainly we, like any other community, have them, but they have no recognition or appreciation of the housing problems in Toronto. And I hear the people of Quebec looking for understanding and failing to understand in turn and vice versa.

So I think one of the practical and pragmatic things that has to be done in this province—should be done in the country, but let us start with home base first—is learn to understand each other, learn that we do have much in common, but break down the barriers that arise because somehow this part thinks that this part is getting more than they are. Once there is that understanding and there is the feeling of fairness, then I think we become very practical as a people and we temper our demands. We are more realistic about what we expect.

I think too that what people are trying to say to all of us, and because of my role I include myself in that, is, "Do something with the information that you have received."

The native people in this area—across Canada, but in Ontario—have to spend far too much time and energy going over the same ground. It will establish that—and I salute the government on the initiatives that I believe you are about to take, but please take them—they are ready to move on. There are many leaders who are ready to do something with it. We do not have, hopefully and thankfully, the race relations tensions that exist in some parts of the province, but they can occur unless we learn how to accept each other's culture and viewpoint.

I think government in general has to also recognize, before we rewrite our Constitution and before we do much more in that respect—and it is tremendously important to understand what we are doing and where we are going and I subscribe to those thoughts—we have to listen to the other cry that is out there: "You are taxing me too much." We are taxing each other too much, our people too much, because we are sometimes literally tripping over each other in trying to do good. We do harm without meaning to. Mr Chairman, I recognize that you have many, many people that you want to hear from today and I will respect the time of the committee.

1350

There are many other things that I would like to dwell on. I too would like to make comment at some other point in time on policing in the province. I would like to talk about the place of French in our community and in any community across the province. I believe in a bilingual Canada but I also believe that we have been, in that area

and in many others, guilty of overkill in regulation and in application. And what we do is, we create fears, and once those have been created, then goodwill and logic have a habit of disappearing.

I do want to thank the committee again for coming to Thunder Bay. I will conclude with one final note and that is, it is a trilevel situation but we all serve the same people. The municipalities have not always been consulted and considered as they ought to be and yet the municipalities are the closest to the people, and I do not mean that in a patronizing way. It is a fact of life.

What we do today is known immediately, and the results of what we do today are known immediately as well, and we have a contribution to make. But for goodness' sake, let's find that high road where, when we sit down and we discuss things, we do it together and we come up with an understanding that says yes, we are working together and we do accept each other.

Thank you, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Mayor. There is some time for one or two quick questions. Mr Eves.

Mr Eves: Mr Mayor, you mentioned several, I think, very important and vital principles in your presentation: pragmatism, understanding and fairness. I wondered if you could perhaps respond to the situation that we in Ontario and every Canadian finds himself in today with respect to the future of our country, and how would you apply those principles to the recent demands that the governing party in the province of Quebec has recently made with respect to its 22 points in the Allaire report?

Mr Masters: I think that is a serious matter. I think it is a situation that has almost gotten out of hand, and the sad part of it is that administratively and in a business sense the two provinces work well together. In the marine field, as an example, we have an international mayors' conference that is largely given its direction and force from the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario working together. What I am trying to say is, with a new Premier and a new cabinet in position, it is not too late to ask for an opportunity of some kind of conference that would dwell on, as I think your own paper itself suggests dwelling on, the strengths of the two economies and how they are interrelated and I think out of that could come the understanding that is required.

I also think there should be a better vehicle for the people of Quebec to explain to the rest of Canada why they are frustrated. What has led to this? That is where the language is a problem. I think we have sort of allowed it to become "us and them" or "them and us," and I think there should be a better vehicle of communication given to Quebec and then we can reciprocate and communicate better with it.

M. Bisson: Premièrement, j'apprécie beaucoup l'accueil que vous m'avez fait au commencement. C'est quelque chose pour moi comme francophone que je prends à coeur et dont je suis très fier.

I think there are a number of things that you said and I think a lot of people need to listen to that message. One of the things you touched on and I would like you to com-

ment on is that one of the things that is troubling people obviously is the amount of taxes that we are having to pay as individuals within our society. The increase of doing government business at the municipal, provincial and federal levels is getting a lot more expensive as we are going along.

I think what I heard you say, if I understood correctly, is that there is a perception out there that if we did not have to give all of these services to people such as francophones or handicapped or whoever, somehow our taxes would come down and that would somehow solve the problem. How do we get the people to understand that equality means there is a pricetag tied on it and what do we say to people? How do we explain it?

Mr Masters: That is not really the way it is. I do not think people really quarrel too much with looking after people who are handicapped or require services. What they do quarrel with is the fact that we all seem to be doing the job, that we do it in a way that is more expensive.

Let us take the francophone situation for just a moment. What people will never understand is, why would we send out 10,000 brochures in both official languages when the potential audience for that brochure—this is not taking away from the principle—when the actual audience is 500? I mentioned the word "fear," and I think these are the things that bother people more. There is the fear that having governmental services in both languages seems to create the impression that if you do not speak French—and believe me I am a supporter of bilingualism so I do not say it from that bias—you are now going to have a reverse discrimination coming in, so you are discriminated against. I think those are real things that bother people and I think that by readdressing that and being practical about it we can cut that down.

Also I think that somehow all of us in government have to find less expensive ways of doing things. I do not think people want to have fewer services. I think they want the services they have. What I was referring to is the fact that there is this suspicion that housing somewhere else is better than here and so I have to go out and get it. I think a lot more understanding and communication in those areas would help us to be more realistic in our demands as taxpayers on the entire system.

Mr Bisson: Can I have a very quick supplementary?

The Chair: No, sorry, Mr. Bisson, we are going to have to proceed. Thank you, Mr Mayor.

PRUE MORTON

The Chair: I call Prue Morton.

Ms Morton: Thank you. I would like to thank the commission for the opportunity to comment on the Constitution, but I would also like to complain of the way in which it proceeds. It has given us a totally insufficient time to respond, and the initial advertisements did not give the exact date, times or place. I only by chance saw the discussion paper, Changing for the Better. If there is to be a real town-hall meeting where people can contribute informally, I am not aware of it. If there is not, there ought to be.

Obviously a great deal of public money has been spent, but it is doubtful if such a badly flawed process can produce much of a result. What it will probably do is confirm the common perception that all governments' commitment to community consultation result in an expensive, time-consuming process which produces beautiful reports but very little results.

The chief trouble with the Constitution is that throughout the country there is a vast distrust of all forms of government, and the bigger and more distant it is, the greater the distrust. Quebec is probably right to want to opt out of the present Constitution. Many other groups feel the dead hand of bureaucracy to be antidemocratic and ineffective also.

In a world where so much is changing so rapidly, we are better off to scrap the Constitution entirely and do without one at least until we can change our paradigms and completely rethink how we can best co-operate using new frames of reference to do so. This is obviously not something that can be decided by locking the premiers up together for a limited time and then refusing to change anything they come up with. It is also much too soon for a referendum, because that cannot ask radically new questions.

It is important that all interested parties, provinces, territories, aboriginal people, big business, small business, labour and so on discuss how their interests can best be served and how they feel they should co-operate and interact with each other. This would take a long time, but what is the hurry? We can make interim arrangements, as is already happening. As the previous speaker just said, to get people to talk together about how they can co-operate is more useful in small groups than to try and settle the whole thing in a few months.

1400

Real democracy is very difficult to achieve in any large country. One vote every few years for a representative who cannot depart from the party line does not give a citizen much power. For that reason it is important for the central government to collect the taxes and then devolve the control over how they are spent as widely as possible, but keeping the power to set and enforce standards.

As a rough blueprint, the following points might be worth exploring.

The Prime Minister to be elected separately, as in the United States.

Members of Parliament should not be bound by a party whip.

I am bringing this to the Ontario commission because Ontario is a very powerful province and any new ideas it has would probably receive some consideration.

More time and power should be given to parliamentary committees.

There should be representation from the aboriginal peoples and from the territories.

The Canadian government should be primarily responsible for foreign policy, for research and for collecting and distributing taxes. This distribution will be to the provinces, territories and aboriginal peoples. The Canadian government should also be responsible for setting and en-

forcing standards to ensure major needs of the people are met.

The Senate should be abolished and replaced by advisory bodies formed of members elected by region to set the standards necessary for each sector: health, social services, education, environment and so on. The Canadian government would then consider the total picture and take the necessary action, bearing in mind that changes might need to be made to accommodate some jurisdictions. For example, some aboriginal groups might want to organize child care quite differently and the standards set might be inappropriate.

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms should be paramount. However, it must be administered in a non-bureaucratic way because human actions rarely fit neatly into the designated slots. There should also be an Office of the Canadian Ombudsman.

There should be no barriers to interprovincial trade and there should be encouragement of Canada-wide acceptance of professional qualifications, educational curricula etc, with language qualifications added according to need.

There should be an intensive drive towards making the entire nation bilingual through the regular education systems. Research as to how countries such as Switzerland manage their language instruction would be valuable. A vast exchange program between English and French students should be instituted for the last year of high school or perhaps added after finishing high school, in which case it could become something like a youth corps which took on jobs that communities cannot afford to have done. Although this is not a short-term solution, if people were truly bilingual we would not need to put things in both languages. It would not matter, except in cases where there are specialist terms which people would not know.

In its entirety, I am sure that this scheme is unworkable, but the ideas contained in it could be useful if our present ways of thinking are open to change, which they must be. The only thing impossible is the status quo.

I have not in this letter brought out at all the other major problem, which is the relations between big business and the rest of the country. That is another major problem which needs to be gone into, probably not right outside the present context.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms Morton. Just on your last point, if you, as you think about those other issues, want to send us your comments, we would appreciate receiving them. I just want to say that again we realize, as I said at the outset, some of the problems with the time lines. We intend to very clearly make sure that the discussion does continue and we will look for appropriate ways to ensure that that happens. Thank you very much, ma'am.

NORTHWESTERN ONTARIO WOMEN'S DECADE COUNCIL

The Chair: Next is Leni Untinen from the Northwestern Ontario Women's Decade Council.

Ms Untinen: Good afternoon. The Northwestern Ontario Women's Decade Council is a non-partisan, volunteer-based organization composed of members of district women's groups as well as individuals. Its main goal is to

improve the quality of life of women in northwestern Ontario in all spheres, economic, social and political. For the past 14 years, we have worked on issues and concerns of northern women. Present priorities include woman in economic development, women against violence and mental health.

Canada enters the 1990s at the crossroads of Confederation and provincial sovereignty. To the citizens of Ontario these are threatening, confusing and emotional times. It is interesting to imagine that 50 years from now circumstances, information and decisions which seem so complicated today may be captured in a page or two of history. A frightening prospect is how the perception of this decade's history will be recorded.

Will the chapter read: "In the 11th hour the dice were rolled behind closed doors. After 124 years of Confederation, leaders of the country and provinces were unable to negotiate outstanding constitutional accord issues before a deadline agreed upon late one night in the kitchen of the government centre at Meech Lake. And so the nation of Canada began the process to dismantle"?

Will historians write that Canadians were unable to respond to their aboriginal peoples' wants? Or was it their needs? Or was it their legal rights? Will it be recorded that Quebec made stringent demands because of its unique qualities or because of its legal rights? Will the motivation seem to be selfishness and arrogance or because of a fear of assimilation based on Canada's record of assimilating aboriginal people? Will history refer to broken promises and treaties? Will historians have access to information on legislation, contracts and conventions that we as decision-makers should be considering today but are unaware of?

In 1882 Ernest Renan wrote: "A nation is a soul, a spiritual principle...a nation is a great solidarity, created by the sentiment of the sacrifices which have been made and of those which one is disposed to make in the future. It presupposes a past; but it resumes itself in the present by a tangible fact: the consent, the clearly expressed desire to continue life in common."

By this definition Canada may have lost the opportunity to make the decision to continue as a nation. Sadly, many Canadians have lost the desire to continue life in common. The tragedy of this situation is that we will have lost by default: not that we as a society tried and could not, but because we forfeited our chance.

We too often have allowed our elected representatives all authority and all responsibility, and those to whom we have given power have tried to protect us from dealing with decisions by seeking to impose solidarity, not understanding. The ability to make appropriate decisions lies in an understanding of the past history, the present circumstance and future direction, an understanding that many Canadians do not possess.

Each of us has opinions and emotional sentiments, but what many of us lack is the understanding that the actions of various sectors of our Canadian and Ontarian society are rooted in history. We lack knowledge of that history. We lack clarity on what are demands and what are inherent rights of sectors of our society. We lack the concept that

there could be nations within the nation, just as there are families within a family.

Ontario has the technology to inform and educate citizens on the diversity of our people, the legislation and treaties which influence our multicultural, bilingual practices and programs. The province must convey to the people the information required to make educated and just decisions. Ontario must have the will and determination to assist the people of the first nations of our province in achieving satisfactory negotiations of their agenda for self-government, land claims and quality of life issues.

Pierre Berton in his book *Why We Act Like Canadians* wrote: "We know who we are not even if we aren't quite sure who we are. We are not American." This statement may be more accurate today than when it was written in 1982. Symbols of our identity, the vision of Via Rail on steel tracks connecting people from sea to sea, the Canadian beaver, the prairie wheat fields, the abundant timber forests and the monarchy have either changed or diminished in symbolizing the face of a developing Canada. All people, as individuals and collectively, require an identity, to know who we are and where we came from, to build on, to change, reflecting changing times, cherishing valued old traditions and creating new ones as we grow.

The grief experienced with the fading of some of Canada's symbols is not in the loss but in the void. As Canadians, as Ontarians, we need to establish positive new symbols bridging our diversity from our country's east-west extremities, from our province's north-south borders. We need to embrace the concept of existing independently together, sharing our raw materials and technology, enjoying urban and rural lifestyles, respecting the colour and traditions of our multicultural backgrounds and the sounds of our bilingual languages, being proud of a profile of men and women working side by side, valued equally.

1410

Our symbols should not be imposed on each other, but welcomed and protected by each of us, uniting our commonness, celebrating our differences, blending through growth not revolution. The face of Canada and Ontario is a mosaic, the total sum of our parts, available to each of us to claim as we desire, where appropriate. We as Ontario and Canadian citizens are a great deal more than not American.

Canadian politics have been traditionally based on a patriarchal model with a rigid, lineal decision-making process. This process focuses on "power over" rather than the "power to" and decision-making from the top down. The Meech Lake accord followed this model. The process has proven wrong and further may prove to be devastating for Canada as a nation. The inclusion of Quebec in the Constitution did not have to place women's rights in jeopardy, ignore Canada's aboriginal peoples' concerns or relegate Canadians living in the Yukon and Northwest Territories to a second-class, non-participatory position.

Voices calling for amendments to protect the rights of all people were wrongly labelled anti-Quebec, amounting to emotional blackmail. Public consultations and hearings could have and should have been taken seriously. Native and women's organizations have continued to be silenced

through cuts to their organizational and publication or broadcasting budgets. The legacy of Meech Lake is an enforced silence and a country polarized by protectionism.

Ontario must demonstrate leadership in utilizing the skills and expertise of the people of the province by developing a model of true consultation on issues affecting their lives. The province must convey to the people the information required to make educated and just decisions. The province must exhibit its social conscience as a basis of the framework of our development.

This very moment, as we stand looking towards the future, a world war rages between countries seeking and retaliating to "power over." This very moment war rages in homes across the province. One in eight women is physically battered by her partner in a domestic relationship. This very moment war rages in our communities. One in four females and one in eight males are sexually assaulted before they are 18. This very moment war rages on Ontario's children. Hundreds of thousands will be physically and emotionally abused and/or be forced to live in poverty. This very moment many Ontarians fear war with our francophone and aboriginal sisters and brothers.

Ontario has tremendous natural and human resources. We have the capabilities to empower our people. We can share the "power to" rather than inflict "power over." There is no future in "power over."

Ontario's future lies in its financial viability. Canada's future lies in economic sharing between the have and the have-not provinces. Federal-provincial co-operation, not provincial sovereignty, will facilitate the appropriate distribution of our country's great wealth of resources. Canada will not survive as a nation without economic security for all partners.

All Ontarians need to understand clearly and simply what the deficit is, both grammatically and numerically. How was this deficit caused? What is its relationship to the provincial debt and the national debt? What are our assets? What are our liabilities? What and to whom do we as a province and a country owe? What individual personal financial practices and decisions affect the provincial and federal deficits and debts?

In terms of the recession, we need to know the contributing factors. What part does the world economy play? What part is affected by the United States economy? What is Canada's role, Ontario's role, the individual's role? Only with this information can individuals respond.

Each of us in our daily lives is called upon to balance our incomes and expenditures and to decide for which investments we are prepared to incur debt. We do this with facts and figures and understand the consequences of not adequately budgeting. We also understand within our family units which individuals are disadvantaged and dependent and where and why we must share our resources. While we do not all agree on priorities and methods, we have the knowledge to decide where we will spend, where we will save and where we will share.

We need this information at the provincial and federal levels and we need facts, not propaganda. We are aware of how our governments' financial actions affect our daily lives. We need to know how our daily practices affect our

governments' financial actions. We need to consider that some of us have the freedom to make financial choices and some of us can barely survive, needing assistance with even basic necessities.

In Ontario the information which will affect our economic future is not the property of a small, élite group of financial experts and political managers. The consequences will be shared by all Ontarians. The information, the total picture, not bits and pieces, must be shared by all Ontarians. The Ontario government must give the people, all of the people, the total information in a format that is clear, concise and understandable.

Despite many concerns from across the country, the federal government entered into the Canada-US free trade agreement. "Its intent was to improve the economies of both countries, to strive for full employment and improve living standards, and to strengthen both countries in the international marketplace; with both countries' ability to take measures to safeguard public welfare fully preserved."

The agreement appears to be falling short of its goals. Ontario's unemployment statistics continue to creep higher. Canadians have seen major changes to their unemployment program. In Thunder Bay alone, welfare payments are up 53%, the case load up 47%. Municipal council and administrators search for ways to cut community-based support programs to cover mandatory income benefits.

"Outshopping" has become a new Canadian word. The Pigeon River border crossing, which serves the relatively small portion of Ontario's residents in the northwestern Ontario area, reports that \$19 million in declared goods were brought across the border in a one-year study period prior to ending July 1989. And the Thunder Bay Venture's report on outshopping notes that the 37 border points studied report similar increases across the country.

Manufacturers and retailers press for additional concessions in their attempt to compete. Canadian and Ontario companies attempt to negotiate salary and benefit freezes or reductions. Health and safety standards may be threatened in the name of production. Ontario companies or branch plants have closed or moved to southern locations resulting in job losses, and Canadians now pay a goods and services tax not imposed on exported goods.

In answer to our questions about the possible plus side of free trade, we are encouraged to see all recent financial concessions and crises as unrelated. In the meantime, without a verdict on the original agreement, the Canadian government approaches a Canada/US agreement with Mexico. Uninformed and concerned, Ontario citizens fear these further negotiations. Ontario owes its citizens an honest scorecard on the positive and negative results of free trade and its relationships to other financial situations.

1420

The Ontario government must not support further free trade agreements without an adequate sharing of information, facts and options through a consultative process and with direction from an educated society.

Ontario's economic goals must include a broader-based definition of economic development and must incorporate

long-range planning into industrial growth, job creation and quality-of-life considerations.

Looking at the economy from everyone's perspective is essential to develop the potential of Ontario. Economic development must be looked at in a total sense: "This includes reasonable industrial expansion, job creation, and economic growth, along with quality-of-life considerations; adequate and affordable housing, recreation and cultural facilities, traditional as well as alternate education systems, health care facilities and a full range of support services. Other necessary considerations include accessible 24-hour child care and convenient public transportation."

Economic development has traditionally been an issue concerning the business and political sectors. Women and their concerns have generally been excluded from the planning and implementation process. Development schemes must not perpetuate the assumption that women exist only as dependents of men.

Employment and Immigration Canada's report, the Ontario Labour Market, 17 November 1990, states, "Ontario's seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was 2.1% higher than November 1989. Since November 1989, nine out of every 10 jobs lost were accounted for by men, reflecting the severe downturn in the male-dominated manufacturing and construction industries." These figures may be viewed as a trend. This is substantiated by Success in the Works; A profile of Canada's Emerging Workforce, Employment and Immigration Canada, 1990, and Labour Market Trends, Ontario Ministry of Skills Development, both of which project that while the labour force is growing at only half the rate it was during the 1970s, women's participation will increase and account for half of the workforce in 10 years.

While we could interpret this to mean good news for women, we must look at further related statistics. From the Ontario Women's Directorate Database 1990, we know that women earn an average of 64.8% of male earnings. The 1988 Statistics Canada female earnings for full-time, full-year employment was \$23,260. Of women with at least one child under the age of six, 60.6% participate in the labour force and face costs of up to \$6,000 per year per child for licensed child care. Further, we know that the average family income for single-parent employed female-headed families was \$19,740. The face of the labour force and the economics of Ontario is changing.

In addition to paid employment, a recent socio-economic study on women's work by the Northwestern Ontario Women's Decade Council highlighted 69% of the respondents estimating that they spend more than 20 hours per week on household tasks. Add to this the hours of volunteer activities that women contribute to their community and we have a true picture of the double workload women continue to carry.

The shift in the male-female workforce participation rates, the disparity in earnings and subsequent disparity in taxable incomes and the fact that more women will become primary income earners has serious financial and systemic implications for women, for both traditional and non-traditional families and for the community and the province of Ontario.

What is needed before future decisions are made is a more realistic perspective of women's role in today's society. Women must be an integral part of planning the future.

In working to advance the status of women, we have learned—

The Chair: Excuse me, Ms Untinen. You have reached the end of your time, if you would just summarize and conclude, please.

Ms Untinen: We have learned to share knowledge, skills, expertise and resources. Power is achieved through empowerment and the collective "power to." By embracing the feminist perspective, Ontario could model a process that will serve the future of the province, the country and the people well.

The spirit of women in northwestern Ontario is captured in the following lines:

Across the vastness of northwestern Ontario lies
an invisible chain.
Never still, the live movements of northern women
stir the linkage,
The echo of the chain vibrates through its length
and rings out across the country,
Threat causes the chain to pull taut and call on its
collective strength.
Hurt moves the chain to circle and protect.
Energy flows along the chain to the weariest link.
With achievement and celebration the chain
shines.
Should the chain knot: caring hands work
tirelessly to ensure the chain is restored.
The links of the chain are woven through the
patchwork of women's lives,
Representing their work; their history; their vision.
Each of us holds tight, drawing on, strengthening,
giving the chain life.

It is our wish to extend this spirit to the people of Ontario and to Canada.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

BOB ROSEHEART

The Chair: We will move on to the next presenter, Bob Rosehart, president of Lakehead University.

Mr Rosehart: Good afternoon. I have prepared a very brief summary and perhaps I will just read it for you.

A new Canada. Thank you for the opportunity to address you today. As president of Lakehead University during the past few years, I have had the opportunity to be confronted with many of the issues in front of you today.

Your theme, Canada at the Crossroads, is appropriate, and equally important, I think you should try to focus on a vision of Canada in the future. A replay of the events of the past eight years in particular I feel will not be useful. This is a time to look forward, not a time to look at the past and to point blame at various processes and governments and whatever.

Canada is a geographical and cultural mosaic that from a systems engineering perspective would no doubt be considered to be inoperative. Our pioneering spirit over the years, coupled with our vast natural resources wealth, has

put us in the big leagues of the industrialized nations without perhaps really earning our way there. Additionally, a considerable degree of our secondary manufacturing base, which as we know is mature and overmature in this province at the present time—many of those plants were a result of US branch-plant type activity which had little research and development activity behind them, and quite honestly we see many plant closures in southern Ontario and the rest of Ontario that reflect this, unfortunately.

The original reason for the creation of these plants related to cheap energy from Niagara in the Sir Adam Beck era and the relatively low cost of labour and raw materials. Perhaps this explains to some extent why Canadians, and Ontarians in particular, suffer somewhat from an inferiority complex and often like to avoid issues, rather than seriously confront them.

Unfortunately, today no nation or province is an island in our global economy and this trend will continue to increase. Canada needs to have a long-term vision that is based on further investments, not liabilities. Quite often in the private sector and occasionally in government people see investments in education as a liability and increasing grants as a liability. These really have to be looked at as further investments in education.

In Canada our spending on research and development as a function of our gross national product has actually declined in recent years. In terms of industrial R and D, it was nothing to be proud about in the first place. We really have to look at further investments in education, research and development and serious moves toward a value-added society.

I guess the question is, can we do it? I would honestly have to say, after observing other jurisdictions in the world and travelling often to many parts of Canada, that I think the jury is out. To be successful we will have to learn to deal with not only being too dependent on our neighbours to the south, but also learn to constructively deal with regional and cultural challenges in this country.

If we do not deal with these issues successfully, I feel the gradual slipping of our standard of living will further encourage ties with our neighbours to the south. I am not sure that Ontarians in general share this consensus or have really given it any serious thought. I do however notice that people tend to get somewhat excited when their standard of living is in decline. I believe, particularly in southern Ontario, the current recession is taking its toll in mature industries, but there is still a feeling out there that we will be looked after. It may be true, but with the fiercely competitive environment of the Far East and Europe, I am really not sure who is going to come and be our champion and our saviour.

1430

When one looks at the future relationship of Quebec to Canada, one has to view the events of the last 20 years as a strong suggestion that if political factors alone are the driving force, Quebec is almost assured to become some type of largely independent entity. If we, however, look towards some new vision of Canada that is very much more tied to the socioeconomic development of all regions of Canada, then perhaps there is some hope for Canada. The frustra-

tion, however, for those directly involved, at least at present, is that Quebec refuses to participate in any meaningful way in any federal-provincial discussions.

To conclude, a strong, new vision is needed of Canada and its people. Canada, in many ways, for the first time is an endangered species. Perhaps it is this threat which will bring out Canadian patriotism. If this is to succeed, however, much more patience, understanding, tolerance and compromise will be necessary by all Canadians than has been exhibited in the past few years.

The elements of a new national vision should include:

(a) Strong, viable and co-ordinated leadership by all levels of government: In this context maybe Canada seriously needs to look at other types of taxation systems, for example, whereby municipal levels of government receive directly a share of income tax wealth instead of this current system where we have a very centralized and hand-me-down system of government. Perhaps there needs to be a considerably revised system. Not that it is exactly an economic model of prosperity itself at the present time, but the system of taxation they have in Sweden and the sharing between the municipalities, the provinces, or counties in that case, and the national government does provide a lot of encouragement at the local level. I think local municipalities find their current situation extremely frustrating.

(b) A socioeconomic strategy that will allow the restructuring of our business and industrial activity: There is lots of talk about these kinds of strategies. As the talk continues, I do not see our spending on R and D increasing all that much. I do not see the kinds of venturesome incentives that would encourage value-added industry, and what we have is continued plant closings.

(c) A constitutionally based acknowledgement of the societal rights of our aboriginal peoples.

(d) An acknowledgement of the historical duality of the English and French cultures in Canada: Here I am not talking specifically about language, but it is hard in the Canadian context to ignore the history, no matter how much people want to ignore our history. In this community you are visiting here today, this area was first settled in I believe, 1811, with the French fur-trading post, Old Fort William, and it was in 1869, I believe, that a surveyor by the name of Simon Dawson got out of a boat at a place called Prince Arthur's Landing, which is now the foot of Dawson Road in Port Arthur, and ever since then we have had our own little microcosm here, our microCanada debate in Thunder Bay.

(e) Regional development strategies that, quite honestly, were very much in vogue in the last 1960s and early 1970s: Perhaps they were before their time, but it is probably time for another wave of regionalism in Canada. Perhaps living in the north you become a bit focused on this, that if things do not happen in either Montreal, Toronto or Vancouver, it is not Canada. There is a lot of Canada outside the few major cities of this nation.

In summary, a major challenge of any new vision of Canada is to achieve widespread public support for and patriotic pride in our unique society. At present this will involve a major reordering of individual Ontarian's priorities. For whatever reason, we are a society in Ontario and

also Canada that is very self-centred. If you look at some of the very successful countries of the world today, in terms of social programming, in terms of industrial activity, research and development and education. A lot of those countries and a lot of those jurisdictions have a lot more pride that they visibly show in their region, than the typical resident of Ontario or the typical Canadian.

It is possible, but probably not without further threats to the nation of Canada as we know it today. To fail, however, is to see the disintegration of Canada and the inevitable fragmented association with our neighbours to the south. I would suggest to you that Canada is well worth the fight, but are Canadians up to the battle?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Rosehart. There are a few questions that we will be able to take. Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Thank you. Welcome to the hearings. I wonder if you might comment. One of the things that has come through in all the discussions over the last number of years is that perhaps politicians are not regarded in that high a light that we should be entrusted with trying to resolve some of these issues. While I think we all accept that perhaps some of that is understandable, none the less, the political people are ultimately elected and will have to be involved in any decision. To what extent do you think we should be looking at other approaches? For example, as a university president, are there things which the universities throughout the country could do in dealing with some of these issues? Should we be looking at bringing together representatives from a variety of walks of life in a way not unlike what happened in Quebec in the late 1960s when it tried to put together a sort of estates general?

One of the themes of your paper is to look at doing some things differently and I wonder, from your own experience, whether we need to be getting some of these other national groups and organizations working at this in the same way that we are.

Mr Rosehart: I think the trick is, not just the universities or the colleges or the school system, but to get all Canadians really seriously discussing these issues. There is a variety of ways that you can do that. You can do it, you know, through curriculum units in elementary and secondary school; you can do it through similar activities in colleges and universities. One of the things that constantly amazes me is that one of our levels of government funds all sorts of foreign academics to come and study Canadian culture. In fact, I remember going to a conference in Minneapolis a few years ago where there was a chap from a small university in Ohio who had observed the dance traditions of a northern Manitoba town during its winter carnival. He presented an academic paper on this and he would make use of such words as "his operatives." The locals did not want to tell all about what they were doing, but his operatives would tell him the meaning of some of these things. I thought at the time it was sort of interesting that it was our tax dollars paying for this.

At the same time, these kinds of encouragements for forums and research in Canadian universities are not there. So to give you a shorter answer, I think anything that could be done at all levels. These particular hearings under the

jurisdiction of the province and also Mr Spicer's endeavour, I think, will bring out people. Over the television in the last couple of days I think you provided a forum for people to speak out that they would not have had before. There was a lot of criticism in the past of these things being behind closed doors.

I think the challenge you have now as politicians is, you have the responsibility. You are going to hear lots of input. I think at some point leadership becomes an issue. I would suggest some of these issues, if you listen to the public opinion polls or if you take a straw vote, you will do Canada a disservice, and that is where you are politicians and the rest of us are people on the street.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Rosehart. We will have an opportunity, no doubt, later on to continue our discussion informally. Thanks for your comments.

BOB RONGITS

The Chair: We will move to the next speaker, Bob Rongits.

Mr Rongits: First off, I would like to congratulate the Premier of Ontario for making this opportunity possible for me and for other people in Ontario. I know you people have been taking a lot of criticism for the initiative you have taken, but I disagree. I think it is an excellent opportunity for ordinary Canadians to express their views. You did not open a can of worms; the can of worms has been around. You just have not heard about it.

It is especially important for the north because we have very few outlets to express our anger and I know you have heard quite a bit and, you know, all sorts of things like that.

I have been a student here for three years and I have been a university student for five. I have been at four universities, in Europe and a whole bunch of other places. I have been around the country and, you know, I am very proud to be a Canadian and I am concerned about Canada's future.

1440

There is no true-blue Canadian city of very large size between Winnipeg and Toronto, and in between this space you have the wealthiest part of the world still unexploited. I am not sure if the environmentalists want to exploit it. I am not sure if we as Canadian citizens want to exploit it. But let's just face it; it is there. We have a huge fault in Atikokan. We have a huge fault in Sudbury. We have minerals. We have resources. Who is going to control it? The people of Thunder Bay receive goods and we are a hinterland economy. We are not a heartland economy; southern Ontario is a heartland economy. The hinterland economy is in Thunder Bay. It needs to become a heartland economy and very quick. It needs to become a heartland economy because if it does not, then we are going to lose control and we are going to lose control to the state of Minnesota.

The closest large city we have is Duluth, and it is a four-hour drive, yet the people of Thunder Bay gladly go there and they gladly spend their money there. And if you ever get a chance to go there, I would invite you to spend some time here; I would invite you to spend some time and talk to the people, meet the people in university, meet people in the pub and find out what we think. Because we

are Canadians as well, okay? And it is simply, people vote with their feet and it is because people have very little money up here. The average Ontario income is \$50,000. We in the north do not have that. I do not think there is 20% of the people who make \$50,000 a year. I would like Ontario to know this because I think that is very important.

Also one other problem that the north has is that the youth tends to leave. I came to the north, I did not leave. Why does the youth leave? After four years here, I have come to some conclusions. One of the reasons the youth leaves is that there is very little to do up here. It is very cold, but it is not a problem. It is a lovely place. It is a city of 200,000 people if you count the suburbs, and yet who controls the media up here and the communications and the radio stations? We have two FM stations, a few AM stations and one television station. What other city of this size in Ontario has one television station? There is not one, okay?

Thunder Bay is a very important city because it is the outfitting centre for the north and it is more important than any other city that has 200,000 population just because of the hinterland it controls. And it is not because the people of Thunder Bay are great; it is because it is in such a location. It is very important. It is on the alluvial plain and all that. It is colder up here. All students up here need a vehicle. All citizens up here need a vehicle.

We need to spend more money on ourselves, you know, and in the wintertime it is minus 20 normally here. You have gotten a very good glimpse, very, very beautiful weather, but to be honest, more often than not it is very cold up here. And you know, we need to address that, maybe not this generation but the next generation. And let's get the communications going; let's get more FM stations; let's get more TV. Let's get more fun things going and then the youth will stay and you will have your problems solved. When the youth stays, the entrepreneurs stay, everyone stays and everyone is happy and then you have a very proud, true-blue Canadian city. That is all I really have to say about that.

Another misconception I think that has been developed about the north is that it is a welfare state. I am originally from Hamilton. Most people in southern Ontario think that we dole out a lot of money to welfare and things like that. Actually I think more money goes into the central coffers in Toronto and very little comes back. The pulp mills, the lumber, the mineral rights and all these things generate a substantial amount of revenue and you cannot forget that. I think it should be redistributed. Everything goes to the central coffers, including, for example, just simple things like fishing licences. It all goes into the central fund. Very little comes back to us and I wish we would look more into getting more money for ourselves. But that is not for me to decide; that is for the people of Ontario to decide.

I think the Fathers of Confederation would be proud of me for saying this, but I think we should dust off all those old manuals about creating a new province and think about northern Ontario. Whether you disagree or disagree with me, I think it would be a wonderful thing for the country to consider partitioning another area of land and having another province. Maybe I am wrong, maybe you do not

think I am right. Let's think about it and talk about it, because the wealth is there. We can support ourselves. The intelligence is here too. Let it bloom.

That is it.

The Chair: Thank you. If you hang on, there are a couple of questions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Bob, I think you did what your university president did before you. He talked about his recommendations as being vision and I think your recommendations are visionary. I am very interested in what you are talking about, that people are voting with their feet and going to Duluth.

Mr Rongits: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You said a little bit about communication strategies that would keep people here. Could you say a little bit more about what would perhaps convince people that there is quite a bit on this side?

Mr Rongits: The problem Canada has is that we do not have any money any more, but we need to build an infrastructure that maybe is not profitable in 1991 and 1992. By the time 2000 or 1999 comes around, it will be. That is what I think.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you say a little bit about it?

Mr Rongits: We just got cellular phones—Prince Rupert is another economy very similar to ours; it has about the same amount of people—and those are excellent tools in the bush for communication. We just got them. Why were we the last people to get them?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Can you say a little bit about the retail or manufacturing or that area that you think might help?

Mr Rongits: Much of it is subsidized by. You know, we have Can-Car and all these wonderful things. One thing, with this opportunity, let's talk about western Canada, because Thunder Bay is in Ontario but we have a large influence from western Canada. Let's look at the subsidies that the European Economic Community has for grain, for example. Western Canada is reeling and it is complaining about all the subsidies, the United States cannot do anything about it either way.

The west is always considered in a bind; what about Thunder Bay? It is the rail network for the east. What about the Fort Frances area and all those little, small farms and those little, small alluvial plains? They all got bought out and they all became ineffective and unproductive years ago because of all of this subsidization that is going on. And in the north you just cannot do it. I mean, the growing season is too short, but we would like to grow our own food, I am sure. I am not the best person to talk to about that; I am still a student. I have only been here for four years and it is too complex. You cannot come up here in one day and understand the north. The trees are different, the climate is different, everything is different.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you, in your short time, for helping.

The Chair: If we do it briefly, question and answer, we will allow one more.

Mr Bisson: I have never been known to be brief.

The Chair: I know. That is why I am going to encourage people to try very hard.

Mr Bisson: Yes. The thing I would just like to get to is that you touched on a couple of points, I think, that are important. What you are basically saying is that you see the nation of Canada having to provide infrastructure by which the regional differences could be, first of all, realized, and then sort of tackled so that we can sort of tie those regions together as a nation.

The difficulty, though, is that when a federal government or even a provincial government attempts to do that, the bottom line is it costs money. We can use that argument in a number of issues—if we talk about northern development, if we talk about French-language rights, if we talk about access for the disabled, it all costs money. What do you say to Canadians? I agree with you that it is something we have to do, but how do you explain that argument to Canadians, to understand that if we want equality in this country, it is going to cost the price? What do you say?

Mr Rongits: Do you want money?

Mr Bisson: Yes, sure, give me some.

Mr Rongits: Okay. Canada is the third-largest producer of gold in the world. Make a tax credit so that every Ontario resident can buy one ounce of gold and the province will have an extra nine ounces of gold in its Treasury. Not in the government Treasury but in the people's Treasury. Short-term problem, long-term bonanza. It is just one example of visionary things that you can do if you think about that, you know. We need a container for it.

I do not know how to solve the money problems. One third of our federal budget goes towards paying interest on the national debt. That is much too large, just the interest on it. No, we do not have money, that is true.

The Chair: Thanks very much.

1450

ASSOCIATION FRANCOPHONE DU NORD-OUEST DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: Now to Ivan Trotter, l'Association francophone.

M. Trotter: Je tiens à remercier le comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération pour l'opportunité qu'il m'accorde aujourd'hui. L'Association des francophones du Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario, l'AFNOO, m'a délégué pour transmettre l'opinion qu'elle s'est faite relativement au rôle que l'Ontario devrait et doit jouer dans les débats constitutionnels présents.

L'AFNOO est une association qui se compose de 25 groupes affiliés, ce qui représente environ 10 000 francophones. Ses débuts remontent à 1976 et depuis ce, la communauté francophone est dotée de nombreuses institutions : écoles françaises, conseils scolaires francophones et bientôt un centre scolaire-culturel francophone, un centre médico-social communautaire francophone et une garderie francophone. Donc, ceci prouve le dynamisme de la communauté francophone de notre région.

L'AFNOO croit que la constitution doit reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit

les communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone. Par contre, nous nous désolons à entendre toutes les remarques préjudiciables et désobligeantes tenues à l'égard de la communauté francophone. À ce moment-ci, il s'impose enfin de rappeler le rôle prépondérant de la communauté francophone dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario, rôle qui remonte à tout près de quatre siècles.

Ceci dit, permettez-moi de décrire la vague de déclarations d'unilinguisme qui a révolté les communautés culturelles de l'Ontario avec l'aide d'une analogie. Le peuple ontarien, et surtout anglo-ontarien, promouvait la sauvegarde et la préservation de l'environnement. Ils veulent conserver les forêts vierges, assainir les cours d'eau, protéger la faune, assurer la survivance de la flore. Pourquoi, je dis pourquoi est-ce qu'ils veulent le faire? C'est tout simplement pour augmenter la qualité de vie des gens. Qu'est-ce qui est plus beau que de voir un arbre majestueux au milieu d'une clairière entourée d'oiseaux gazouillants, avec comme musique de fond le ruissellement provenant d'un cours d'eau. C'est cela qui augmente la qualité de vie d'un individu.

Donc, il est évident que la diversité de la vie est proportionnellement reliée à la qualité de la vie. Si je compare cette analogie avec la crise d'unilinguisme, la question que je me pose est : pourquoi, en sachant que la diversité de la vie est proportionnellement reliée à la qualité de vie, est-ce qu'un peuple, les anglophones, tente d'éliminer une ou plusieurs cultures, entre autres la culture française, pour ainsi réduire la diversité des cultures au sein d'une communauté? Une réponse à cette question expliquerait une foule de tensions qui existent entre plusieurs peuples.

Le peuple canadien s'est battu pendant plus d'un demi-siècle à essayer d'angliciser les résidents canadiens sans succès. Je réfère ça au «melting pot» pour ainsi faire place à la vision multiculturelle. Pourquoi aujourd'hui reculer, défier l'évolution et tenter à nouveau ce qui a failli durant plus de 50 ans? Qu'est-ce que le gouvernement attend pour reconnaître la langue française comme outil important du développement de l'Ontario et du Canada? Est-ce que le gouvernement a honte de reconnaître la langue française?

En terminant, l'AFNOO veut faire part de deux structures que l'Ontario devrait considérer. La première : les communautés nationales doivent avoir la possibilité de gérer les structures politiques et administratives des services pertinents à leur épanouissement. C'est un besoin fondamental à combler, à l'aide de mécanismes appropriés. Les communautés nationales doivent être assurées à long terme d'un financement équitable de leurs institutions. La seconde : le statut égal de la communauté francophone doit nécessairement se refléter dans l'organisation des pouvoirs, tant aux paliers fédéral et provincial qu'au municipal. En outre, l'administration publique de la province de l'Ontario doit impliquer davantage ses régions dans l'élaboration de ses politiques sociales, économiques et culturelles.

Sur ce, je vous remercie de l'attention que vous m'avez accordée.

M. le Président: Il y a sans doute des questions ?

M. Beer : Merci pour la présentation par l'AFNOO. Je comprends la crise de l'année passée, mais si on peut mettre ça de côté un moment, est-ce qu'on pense que, avec les changements qui ont commencés dans la province, de plus en plus il y a vraiment un avenir pour la communauté francophone dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario ? Si oui, et j'espère que oui, si votre réponse est toujours oui, quels sont certaines actions, certains programmes que le gouvernement provincial devrait mettre en oeuvre ou continuer ?

M. Trottier : Je voudrais juste clarifier un point : je ne suis pas le président de l'AFNOO ; je suis le directeur général. Je suis ici en tant que délégué parce que le président est retenu ailleurs. Donc, je suis dans l'impossibilité de spécifier les réponses parce que je n'ai pas consulté avec les autres.

M. Beer : Même à titre personnel ?

M. Trottier : À titre personnel, il est évident que la communauté francophone dans le Nord-Ouest a de l'avenir. Personnellement, mon opinion est que, comme l'analogie c'est de la diversité, plus une population est diversifiée, plus elle est intéressante et plus elle est intéressante, plus les gens sont intéressants à vivre, plus les relations sont intéressantes.

M. Bisson : Une petite question : Vous, vous venez de Thunder Bay, n'est-ce pas ?

M. Trottier : Je demeure à Thunder Bay.

M. Bisson : Avec tout ce qui c'est passé vis-à-vis des questions de l'année passée, comment est-ce que vous vous êtes senti dans la communauté ? Moi, mon impression c'est que ce n'était pas l'avis majoritaire. Pouvez-vous m'expliquer un peu ?

M. Trottier : Je suis originaire du Québec. Lorsque cette crise-là est passée, ça a renforcé mes liens avec le Québec. Je parle au nom de moi-même, je parle au nom de Ivan Trottier. Personnellement, quand la crise a passé, j'ai dit, ça y est, je suis un Québécois. Ça a confirmé ma provenance québécoise.

M. Bisson : Comment est-ce que vous vous sentez comme Québécois ici ?

M. Trottier : Je me sens comme isolé. Je me sens comme rejeté. Juste un exemple, encore ce matin, il y a une dame qui m'a appelé au bureau et elle m'a dit : « Hier, on était au 'bowling' et je parlais avec mon mari en français. La personne avec qui on jouait, une anglophone, nous a dit, "Pourquoi vous parlez français ? Parlez anglais. Je ne sais pas si vous dites des bêtises à mon propos." » Toutes des remarques comme ça, je trouve que c'est un manque d'éducation premièrement. Les gens ne sont pas éduqués face au multiculturalisme ; les gens ne sont pas éduqués face au bilinguisme. Je trouve ça déplorable — c'est un manque à leur culture — même si je me sens proche d'être bilingue. Je suis capable de bénéficier des deux cultures et je crois que c'est une richesse immense.

ACCUEIL FRANCOPHONE

The Chair: The next speaker is from Accueil francophone.

M. Lepage : Mon nom est Roger Lepage. Je voudrais remercier les membres du comité de me permettre de dis-

cuter avec eux de mes visions et de mes sentiments au sujet du rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Je représente l'Accueil francophone de Thunder Bay, qui est une agence qui offre des services de traduction et d'interprétation aux membres de la communauté francophone qui font demande des services sociaux, médicaux et légaux. Mais je suis ici quand même comme un francophone, un Ontarien et un Canadien.

Je voudrais féliciter le gouvernement de l'Ontario pour avoir pris cette initiative de nous offrir la chance de parler de nos idées, et pour moi, très souvent de mes soucis.

La question que se pose le gouvernement de l'Ontario est aussi la question que je me pose depuis assez longtemps et je n'arrive pas encore à trouver une réponse valable.

D'une part, je suis très triste de témoigner ce qui se passe au Canada présentement, de la part d'Ottawa mais aussi de toutes les autres provinces. La francophonie en moi m'encourage à célébrer avec le Québec le fait que la possibilité de la société distincte que le Québec représente est peut-être très prête à célébrer par elle-même ses différences, plus spécifiquement sa culture française.

1500

Je crois fortement au fait que la communauté francophone fait partie du Canada, en tant que peuple fondateur, tel que reconnu par le gouvernement de l'Ontario en fait de la Loi 8, concernant des provisions pour assurer l'accès aux services gouvernementaux dans la langue de choix préférée, soit l'anglais ou le français, et aussi que la communauté francophone est reconnue par le gouvernement du Canada comme étant un peuple fondateur. Nous devons sortir de nos petites boîtes qui nous emprisonnent tous et qui ne nous permettent pas de reconnaître la valeur d'une autre langue, d'une autre culture qu'on peut s'offrir à notre merveilleux pays.

Un autre point que j'aimerais aborder est le fait qu'il y a une grosse majorité de la population canadienne mal renseignée au sujet du Canada, du rôle des trois peuples fondateurs et de leur futur rôle. Le Canada n'est pas un « melting pot », mais reconnaît plutôt tous les efforts et les espoirs de toutes nos cultures. La question d'identité culturelle ne devrait pas être mélangée, en outre, ne devrait même pas être discutée dans le même contexte que celle de l'économie. Trop de personnes, trop de groupes d'intérêts sont intéressés à confondre les questions pertinentes en offrant au peuple canadien une avenue pour blâmer ce à quoi notre pays fait maintenant face.

Je suis certain que les membres du comité savent bien que, en temps d'économie positive, les questions mentionnées sont discutées avec calme et raison. Comme je l'ai dit au commencement de mon petit discours, je suis heureux et j'espère, peut-être naïvement, qu'ensemble, comme voix unie, l'Ontario pourra arriver à soulager les problèmes auxquels nous faisons face présentement.

Je n'ai pas les réponses, mais je suggérerais quand même que l'Ontario prenne un rôle décisif et principal pour montrer le chemin au reste du Canada. J'ai quelques recommandations :

La première est que le gouvernement de l'Ontario suive l'action positive de la province du Nouveau-Brunswick en se prononçant une province officiellement bilingue.

La deuxième recommandation, que le gouvernement de l'Ontario reconnaisse son rôle en fait de chien de garde pour assurer à la communauté francophone sa sauvegarde, qui assurera les droits de la population francophone en tant que peuple fondateur du Canada.

Ma troisième recommandation est que le gouvernement de l'Ontario reconnaisse les implications complètes de ses plans futurs pour l'Ontario, afin de servir sa population.

Et maintenant je fais référence au Rapport du Comité d'étude provinciale-municipale sur les services sociaux, qui est aussi reconnu sous le sigle de PMSSR. Ce plan pourrait avoir des effets néfastes pour les minorités, les francophones inclus, dans notre province si les pouvoirs d'administration pour des services sociaux se transféreraient aux municipalités, car nous avons déjà eu un aperçu de certaines municipalités qui sont très rigides dans leur philosophie de desservir certains groupes, comme par exemple la communauté francophone.

Je souhaite aux membres du comité de la Chambre beaucoup d'énergie et mes sentiments d'espoir envers ce sujet.

Mr Harnick: You mentioned Bill 8. As far as you are concerned, in your experience here—I caught very briefly that you are involved with medical services, legal services—has Bill 8 been an adequate bill in terms of providing the necessary services in the French language?

Mr Lepage: Bill 8 has certainly laid a good, solid base and a good groundwork for work to be done. I think the government of Ontario needs to be patted on the back for that bill, specifically speaking as a francophone working in this area.

Mr Harnick: Where should we go from Bill 8, if anywhere?

Mr Lepage: I think you still need to work on Bill 8 a bit. In response to Mr Beer's question of Ivan Trottier, I think the direction this government needs to take foremost is education, educating the public of Ontario about the issues pertinent to the francophone needs in Ontario. By that, I mean the role we have played in Canada. I hear so many people using information that to me just does not reflect what actually is true, and I get worried when this happens.

Mr Harnick: Is the principle that French language services be applied where numbers warrant satisfactory?

Mr Lepage: At this time, yes.

Mr Harnick: In a commonsense sort of way.

Mr Lepage: Yes.

M. Winninger: Je m'excuse, je ne suis pas bilingue et je parle français comme un anglophone, mais j'ai une question pour vous néanmoins.

M. Lepage: Je vous remercie de votre effort.

M. Winninger: Est-ce qu'il est possible de protéger la langue et la culture françaises sans avoir une société distincte au Québec ?

M. Lepage: Sans avoir une société distincte au Québec ? Je crois que oui et comme Canadien, j'espère qu'il y a un espoir. Je n'ai pas les réponses, Monsieur Winninger, j'aimerais avoir les réponses. Je crois que c'est possible, oui.

M. Beer: Une autre question que je pense qu'on veut poser, et c'est un autre aspect du problème : est-ce que les Québécois francophones comprennent bien les francophones de notre province ? Je me demande des fois s'il y a des liens, est-ce qu'il faut créer des liens ou peut-être améliorer la compréhension des Québécois, pour leur faire savoir qu'en effet il y a en Ontario une population francophone qui est vraiment vivante, qui a beaucoup d'outils pour son épanouissement et tout ça ? Quelles sont vos pensées là-dessus ?

M. Lepage: J'aimerais savoir à quels propos ça servirait d'entamer ce sujet-là parce que j'aime séparer les deux questions. Je crois qu'on a des liens en fait de culture française et je crois que oui, en fait d'éducation, nous, en tant que Franco-Ontariens dans le Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario, on est mal renseignés parfois sur ce qui se passe au Québec avec les Québécois, non seulement dans le Nord mais au Québec. Je crois que même les Québécois dans le Nord du Québec ont peut-être de l'information qui n'est pas toujours juste. Est-ce que je peux vous demander pourquoi ?

M. Beer: C'est parce que je pense que l'un des éléments ici... Est-ce que les Québécois pensent peut-être qu'il n'y a pas d'avenir pour les francophones en Ontario ? Des fois j'ai l'impression qu'ils ne comprennent pas du tout la population francophone de cette province. Peut-être que ça peut nous aider, tous les Canadiens, si on comprend mieux qu'au Nouveau-Brunswick, en Ontario ou au Manitoba il y a la possibilité non simplement de vivre en français mais vraiment de s'épanouir.

M. Lepage: Oui, je comprends votre point et pour ajouter à ça, je crois aussi que les mêmes faits sont ici pour la population autre que francophone en Ontario pour comprendre les questions de la communauté francophone en Ontario.

M. Bisson: C'est un peu sur le même plan, ce que M. Beer vous a demandé, de répondre sur cela à un Ontarien ; on est Ontariens premièrement. Vous avez dit dans votre présentation que c'était un avenir que vous regardiez possiblement, l'avenir du bilinguisme officiel ici en Ontario. Premièrement, la question que je pose c'est : quel signal est-ce que ça donnerait au Québec vis-à-vis de l'attitude, comment ils nous voient ici en Ontario ? Deuxièmement, qu'est-ce que ça veut dire pour l'Ontario à votre idée ?

M. Lepage: Je crois que pour le Québec et les Québécois, nous démontrons une tolérance, que présentement on prévoit et on ressent au Canada une intolérance contre les minorités et contre la culture francophone. Je crois que le rôle que l'Ontario pourrait jouer là-dedans c'est être le premier. Je crois que l'Ontario a très souvent joué un rôle de leader pour les autres provinces. Je crois que l'occasion est prime maintenant pour que l'Ontario prenne le volet et se prononce comme province.

1510

The Chair: I have been asked to point out that a table has been set up near the entrance for presenters. If there are people here who are scheduled to present and we have not heard from you yet, would you at some point make your way to the table and pass your names on so we can revise the lists and ensure that everyone is on?

FRED PRETULAC

Mr Pretulac: Welcome to Thunder Bay. I am glad to meet the servants of Ontario, because I think we are the bosses and you are supposed to be paid servants.

You are dealing in all the wrong matters here, I think, with Confederation. Before 1867, this was Upper Canada solely. It was divided along the Ottawa River when the American Revolution came into being. In 1867 they made Upper Canada and Lower Canada. The French owned everything up here past Sioux Lookout. Parliament divided the English and the French, so Upper Canada and Lower Canada, therefore Quebec and Ontario, were born.

I can understand the dilemma of the French people and their frustration, but it is also mine. I am part Ukrainian, part Indian and part French. I can understand none of those languages, just English.

But it hurts to see people suffering, and I think you people, before you get elected, say, "Oh, we're going to do this for you, we're going to do that for you." I do not want you to do a damned thing for me. I want you to do what I want down there, not what some conglomerate or somebody lobbying you people or who pays for you to get into power wants you to do. I want what I think is necessary for northern Ontario, that is, settling aboriginal claims, cutting federal spending for education. Everything that is wrong is all your fault, I think. You are allowing this to happen. You are supposed to be helping us, yet there is more of a hindrance here than help. There are other things, but I get choked up.

We have a Prime Minister I call "The Liar," and "Wimpy Joe" got us into a war overseas. I am a Korean veteran also. I went overseas. I volunteered in the Korean war, and there was no war there; there was an internal revolution. Also, this here, there was no war declared by Canada or the United States on Iraq. It was George Bush and his entourage giving the deadline, and he had to make good on his deadline, and therefore we are involved in a war of not our own choosing. We are a peacekeeping force; we had got a Nobel Peace Prize. Now the credibility of Canada is shot right down the drain. Why? Because politicians are scared to stand up and say no to the Americans? That is about all I can say, because I get mad.

Mr Bisson: The sense I get, and I can understand why you are somewhat choked up, is that what you are feeling is that there is an erosion of the country, and the sense is that we are somehow losing our independence.

Mr Pretulac: No, no, no. It is you people, when you go in elections, who say: "I am going to get you this. I am going to do this for you. I am going to do that for you." I do not want you to do a damned thing for me. That is the whole point. I want you to ask me what I want. We have got an abortion bill that is down the drain.

Mr Bisson: We are talking about the Constitution.

Mr Pretulac: I know, but that is a part of the Constitution. Everything is a part of the Constitution. I am talking about Confederation. Our Constitution in Canada says, "Under the laws of God." Correct? Well, jumping Jehoshaphat, we are running amok here in destroying every law that we are supposed to be living under, and it is all you people's fault. That is about all I have to say.

Mr Beer: You made reference to settling the aboriginal issues. That is an issue that has come up in our hearings. What would your advice be to us? How should we approach that?

Mr Pretulac: Talk to the people, listen to them, do not say, "Just because you are Indian, get back on your reservation." You are trying to integrate the people; they do not want to be integrated. They are hunters and fishers and trappers. I can see their point of view; you people cannot. You do not know anything about hunting and fishing and trapping. That is what makes me so upset and mad. You are going to do so much for the Indian, and you are doing more damage than you can imagine.

Ms Churley: I would like to thank you for coming to speak to us. You are raising a point that I think a lot of Canadians and people in Ontario are feeling, and that is not being listened to: a lot of promises being made during elections and then people feeling not that there are broken promises but perhaps that governments are doing things that people have not really asked for. That is what we are trying to do in this process. We are packing a lot into one month, and we have asked people to come out, and you are doing exactly what we want people to do, to come out and talk to us.

Mr Pretulac: Yes, but the way you people sit here—now, I do not blame you for being like you are. That is your lot in life, so to speak. I never went to high school. I just finished grade school. I never went to university, yet I hear the university and university students give voice to certain things. I understand all those things, and you people do not seem to get the handle on it and I cannot understand why. What the hell is going on here?

Ms Churley: I think you are starting to tell us how, in your view, and that is what I am saying, we as politicians—some of us are new politicians; some of us are older politicians—have a lot to learn, and I am quite interested in anything you have to say about how to do it better, believe me. I am one of the new ones.

Mr Pretulac: I will give you an example. I used to be a shop steward at an industrial plant here in town. I went for election for three years running, and everybody laughed at me because I was so radical. I would say: "What do you want me to do? I will do it. Nothing more, nothing less. If you have got a grievance, if you have got a complaint, sign it, and I will take it into the office." I finally got in, and the union was against me and the company was against me. I did not give a hoot. I got what the men wanted. Now, that is what you people should do. You are just glorified shop stewards. That is the title.

1520

Ms Churley: Just one last question. As a shop steward, what did you do when the workers wanted different things? That is what we are talking about here in the Constitution. A lot of people want a lot of different things. What did you do as a shop steward to deal with that?

Mr Pretulac: I listened and took the complaints to the proper places to be recognized and dealt with. That was it.

Ms Churley: So that is what you think we should be doing here as well?

Mr Pretulac: Yes, that is right.

Ms Churley: Thank you. That is helpful.

The Chair: Thank you for your comments, sir.

Mr Pretulac: By the way, I had something made up to show you. I had this made up for myself. This is for all the casualties the Gulf war is going to suffer. Thank you.

ERNIE EPP

The Chair: I call next Ernie Epp. Go ahead.

Mr Epp: Good afternoon. Mr Chairperson, honourable members of the select committee of the Ontario Legislature, I appreciate this opportunity to address your committee on the vital questions of the social and economic interests and aspirations of all the people of Ontario, within Confederation, and on the form of Confederation that can most effectively meet the social and economic aspirations of the people of Ontario.

As a historian who has been privileged to serve the people of Thunder Bay-Nipigon as their federal representative, I would like to offer a historical answer to these questions. Canada has come to a fork in the road, and it is important that we understand whence we have come before we decide which road to travel in the future.

The history of the Canadian people is in many ways a history of accommodation of differences. Self-government was achieved through the close co-operation of English-speaking and French-speaking Reformers. Confederation was achieved through the close co-operation of the Liberal-Conservatives and the Reformers of the province of Canada. The Confederation vision was of a new nationality that would encompass Canadians of all backgrounds and enable Catholics and Protestants in both language communities to flourish in freedom. Sir John A. Macdonald's Liberal-Conservative Party sought and often obtained the support of both the Roman Catholic bishops and the Loyal Orange Lodges.

This spirit of accommodation met its most severe test in the public school systems of several provinces. Only Quebec has fully respected the conviction of the Roman Catholic Church that the education of their children should be controlled by the church. The other provinces—Ontario, New Brunswick, British Columbia, Manitoba after 1889 and the others, with the exception of Newfoundland—determined that education should be provided in public schools under the direction of a department of education.

Separate schools had been established in what is now Ontario during the period when the two Canadas were under one government; the struggle in these schools after

1900 was between French-speaking parents who sought a bilingual education for their children and the English-speaking who opposed this desire. D'Alton McCarthy's campaign for a unilingual Canada led the Manitoba government to break election promises and to violate the provincial constitution in 1889. Rejection of the Confederation accommodation by the McCarthyites led to a strong assertion of the rights of French-speaking Canadians and served to tear the nation apart during the First World War.

A new vision of the Canadian nation developed in the terrible experiences of the Great Depression and the Second World War. Where the first generation after Confederation had hoped that national policies of westward expansion, railway construction, prairie settlement and a protective tariff would both bring prosperity to all Canadians and unite them through economic nationalism, the generation of the 1930s and 1940s hoped the federal government would accept responsibility for the unemployed and develop economic and social policies that would ensure a national standard of services for Canadians in every part of the country. The policies developed during these years were applied to national and regional problems, by both Liberal and Progressive Conservative governments, for a quarter century after the war.

Where the first national policies eventually aroused strong opposition in the west—this opposition was strongly expressed by the Progressive members who made up the second-largest group in the 1921 Parliament—the new national policies aroused growing opposition in Quebec. Before 1960, Canadians tended to ignore the Quebec assertion that social policy was a provincial responsibility, and the old age security pension and the Canada Council for National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences were created. After 1960, however, it became increasingly difficult for Canadian governments to enact such policies as the Canada pension plan and medicare.

The Canadian spirit of accommodation was expressed in the 1960s by such policies of co-operative federalism as shared-cost programs and opting-out formulas. These policies enabled the federal government to work towards the goal of equal levels of service in every part of the nation while respecting the conviction of the Quebec government that it must control social policy. The federal government also came to recognize the bilingual and multicultural realities of the federal state. It was becoming difficult to speak of the Canadian nation, however, as the Québécois and Québécoises asserted more loudly that they were a nation within Confederation.

The Canadian federal state entered a period of crisis in the late 1960s. A new Prime Minister from Quebec, who was profoundly opposed to all nationalisms, rejected any form of special status for Quebec. He insisted in public that Quebec must be "a province like all the others" while acting on the belief that Canadian governments had been treading on provincial turf. The shared-cost programs were renewed with difficulty in 1972. He had them replaced in 1977 by no-strings-attached grants for medicare and post-secondary education under the established programs financing arrangements. The social results and costs

included extra-billing by doctors in many provinces and the failure of one provincial government to pass on to its universities all of the money it received for them from the federal government, much less matching the sums it received.

The Trudeau legacy includes an individualist Charter of Rights and Freedoms and a constitutional repatriation process that led to the very two-nations situation that he had always claimed to oppose. His first assertion of individual rights in 1969 had threatened status Indians with loss of their rights under the Indian Act, and the later constitutional process led to a recognition in principle of aboriginal rights but little action on this understanding. By 1987, the first nations and other aboriginal peoples knew that recognition of their rights would only be achieved by intense struggle in individual provinces whereas Quebec had received recognition of its distinct society and provincial authority in the Meech Lake constitutional accord.

Canadians will never know whether the Meech Lake accord strengthened or weakened the government of Canada. It is possible that the spending powers clause resolved the problem of federal infringement on the provincial jurisdiction that impeded the development of the new national policies after the Second World War. The fact that the accord made concessions to every province of powers that Quebec alone had consistently sought was another of the Trudeau legacies—Quebec had to be a province like the others—and it revealed how far Canada had moved from co-operative federalism.

Canada is now clearly committed to an experiment or a number of experiments with sovereignty. The first nations demand control of their reserves as well as of a land base that will enable them to flourish in the 21st century. Quebec appears interested in very limited exercise of power by the federal government. Canadians want a strong federal government to ensure that people in Manitoba, New Brunswick and Newfoundland do not suffer simply because they live in the less prosperous areas of our country. After 20 years of substantial accommodation to Quebec's desires, Canadians are saying forcefully that they need a strong federal government and they want to hear leaders who recognize that need and act on it.

Our attempt to satisfy both Quebec and Canada within one Constitution appears to be doomed to failure. The transition will not be easy for a government and a Prime Minister based strongly in Quebec. Many Canadians believe that the present government has not provided for the needs of the Canadians, and this conviction will require the retirement from office of that Prime Minister and government. It is clearly intolerable that he and his colleagues from Quebec should determine Canada's national policies when they have been acting on Quebec's desire to gut national powers.

As the transition is achieved to a Canada no longer hobbled by the constitutional scruples of the government of Quebec and of Quebec's representatives in the federal Parliament, it will be advisable for us to maintain the policies of recognition of aboriginal rights, official bilingualism and multiculturalism that are vital legacies from the past quarter century of Canadian history. The McCarthyite

program weakened Canada in the Great War and the English-speaking minority of Quebec continues to pay for the sins that McCarthy and his followers committed against the Canadian spirit of cultural accommodation. If we continue policies of respect for Canada's minorities, such action should encourage respect for minorities in an independent Quebec. I should perhaps add that Quebec's record on minorities in general is a pretty good record, whatever the English-speaking minority may suffer these days at the local level particularly. It should also reduce the number of refugees crossing the Ottawa River in both directions.

The Canadian experiment has been a noble one, and we need not be ashamed of its failure. Few of the federations created within the British Empire have survived without difficulties of one sort or another. Pray God that we be spared war within our Peaceable Kingdom. You may remember that William Kilbourn published the book in the fall of 1970 during the October crisis in Quebec, one of the ironies of Canadian history.

Let us accept the challenge we now face to accept the separation of Quebec with generosity and to reorganize Canada in that civilized and compassionate spirit that has always characterized the Canadian attitude of accommodation. Both Canada and Quebec will experience liberation through the separation. Having been married so long and by force, let us negotiate as amicable a divorce as we can.

1530

Mr Offer: Mr Epp, thank you very much for your brief and certainly your presentation, a brief historical analysis of accommodations made in the history of this country by the federal government not only to Quebec but arguably to all provinces in this country. I know that you bring forward certain examples of those types of accommodations, whether it be railroads or language or shared-cost programs, all of which can be characterized as accommodations, none the less.

Your brief on page 4 in the last paragraph starts, "Our attempt to satisfy both Quebec and Canada within one Constitution appears to be doomed to failure." As I read your brief, I could have changed that line to state, as a result of the examples you have brought forward in your own presentation, that the history of our country shows a willingness to accommodate not only federal government and Quebec but also all provinces, and then the challenge is upon us to now seek further accommodations.

At this point in our history, in light of the accommodations which have been made towards all provinces in our history, why do you feel that there is no further possibility of accommodation?

Mr Epp: I fear that there is no accommodation now because I think the road we have trod the last 20 years is a dead end for Canada. If we could return to the 1960s and could experiment conceivably with opting-in formulas and programs rather than opting out, if we had federal governments that were eager to meet the needs of Canadians rather than fob them off in one way or another, I think there would be possibilities if Quebec wishes to go with us or if we can achieve the flexibility that would be required

in arrangements with the Bank of Canada, the federal Department of Finance and other departments too, I would expect, to handle the complexities that are involved.

My brief is posited on the assumption that the vast majority of people outside the province of Quebec and some number of people within it want a federal government that provides the kind of leadership that people struggled to achieve in the 1930s and 1940s and 1950s and 1960s. The federal governments for 20 years, in my opinion, have been failing to provide that leadership, and given that kind of political action towards a dead end for the federal state of Canada, I think we need a break which allows Canada to be what I believe the majority of Canadians want it to be.

ONTARIO NATIVE WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I call Marlene Pierre from the Ontario Native Women's Association. Just before you start, in case there is a need for French interpretation in your presentation or others, I am told that some of the transmitters, the devices, are not quite functioning as they should. They are trying to fix that so that please bear with us. Go ahead, Ms Pierre.

Ms Pierre: Thank you. I would like to thank you and the Premier of Ontario, Mr Rae, for the opportunity for the Ontario Native Women's Association to make this presentation. We would like to acknowledge the presence of the various MPPs who are travelling throughout the north and want to express our gratitude that you have all come to the north. We hope this will be the first of many visitations by this government to listen and hear the people in the north. I would like to also acknowledge that we have had in the last two weeks five ministers visit our organization to hear the issues and concerns of the Ontario Native Women's Association. Again, we very much appreciate the attention that is paid to our organization by your government.

I would like to provide some background on the Ontario Native Women's Association. We have been in existence since 1971. At present, we represent 56 native women's locals across the province. Out of those 56 locals we have membership both on and off reserve communities; 32 of our organizations are located off reserve and 23 are on reserve. Twelve of them are in the remote areas of Ontario, two in isolated regions, and also 33 in rural communities. So you can appreciate that we have a great task, to properly represent the views and issues and concerns of women all across the province in their various stations in life.

Our organization is a political organization. We represent grass-roots women, women who find themselves in the poorest of the economic communities across the province. We represent families, and that also includes men. Some of our work has very much affected the lives of men and their families as well.

We also perceive ourselves to have the role of developing skill levels, speaking on behalf of women who would ordinarily not ever have the chance to meet with something like this group, or ministers.

We look at the various issues which affect family and we try to do things that strengthen family units. If I can

share with you the profile of an aboriginal family, I would like, for a moment, if I can, to draw a mental picture for you about the status of aboriginal women and their families. In several studies the Ontario Native Women's Association has conducted, one in 1970, over 50% of our families were single-parent led. Their average income at that time was \$5,000 a year. It has since risen in 1980 to \$8,000 a year. They are reliant on some form of social assistance primarily. Their average size family, 10 years ago, was five; it is now 4.5.

You can grasp what that means in terms of what is really happening at the community level for native women, in that the socioeconomic needs of those people should be addressed in some real fashion by both levels of government and also Indian governments.

The Ontario Native Women's Association has done some other work. In the early 1970s we were able to work, along with other aboriginal women's groups in the country, to change the Indian Act by way of the removal of section 12(1)(b), which was the discriminatory section respecting who we married; if we were to marry someone who was not regarded as a status Indian, we lost our rights.

1540

We are very grateful to one of our first presidents, Jeanette Corbiere Lavall, whom we have honoured, by the way, by way of an annual presentation to women who express the same kind of leadership in their communities. We also went on—primarily, it was the work of the Ontario Native Women's Association and the Quebec women—to ensure the rights of women through the equality clause which was constituted in the Canadian Constitution in 1982. We were largely responsible for that, with the help of the provincial government. I make that point because it was not through the assistance of any of our own governments, but we had to rely in both instances on the white justice system and we had to rely on the white governments to help us maintain some sense of equality within our own rights.

The Ontario Native Women's Association has, as you can see, long fought for equality. It is based on our conception of the inherent rights that belong to all aboriginal people. We have had a difficult time up to this time to make sure that what we saw and what we believe in for families and the future of our children has been greatly handicapped by the fact that we do not have the kind of legal resources that governments have and other types of organizations have to make sure that the rights of those people who are at the grass-roots level are being protected. We see that as a great role for ONWA.

In our deliberations with those five ministers, and hopefully we will be meeting with more, we have expressed through a document which I am going to leave with you—it is a background paper on aboriginal women and self-government. I will also leave with you a copy of ONWA's perception of what Bill C-31 did to the aboriginal movement by all the classifications they now have in determining who we are. It is, again, a government-induced piece of legislation. I will also leave with you a copy of the most recent study ONWA did, which is the family violence study; that most revealingly portrayed what is happening

at the community grass-roots level, that eight out of 10 aboriginal women have been or can expect to be physically, sexually, emotionally abused, and four out of 10 children can expect the same.

I am also going to leave some other documents which will help this committee understand where the aboriginal women in this province and, yes, in the whole country really are at.

In different parts of the country and in different parts of the province, especially in Ontario, there still is a great deal of resistance to women having a say on how their government at the local level should look. We insist in our discussions with the ministers—and hopefully the Premier—that native women, aboriginal women, must be there to design and have an input on how they see their government will be at the local level, because everything they will design will have a daily impact on our lives.

I would like to bring to your attention some of the kinds of things we are going to be dealing with. One very important right of self-government is the right to vote. Any citizen of any government should have the right to vote. Within aboriginal communities anywhere in the province, aboriginal people who are status Indians and belong to bands and have band membership and live off the reserve cannot vote. So as aboriginal citizens, when we are looking in the context of our own government, never mind what Canada looks like, we do not have a say.

Right now there is an activity taking place which again is government-induced, by the federal government. It really bothers us that bands are partaking in this activity. Basically, it is the usurpation of the right to equal access to services and benefits. The department is now requesting that bands distribute new status cards to band members that will portray, by way of an eight-digit number, whether you live on or off the reserve. That is designed so that those who live off the reserve will not have the same equal right of access to services and benefits. When my child goes to school with a child who is also of aboriginal descent, but because he lives in a city and they come from a reserve, he is treated differently? There should be no different treatment of our children, no matter where we live. And with respect to Bill C-31, who we choose to have children with is very much dictated by this bill. Those things, in our minds, are contraventions of every human right that Canadians should stand for.

Perhaps most devastating of all the acts of Parliament, the acts of governments, the local and regional governments, the acts of systems, was to usurp our right to our language. We know that in the province of Ontario there exists all kinds of legislation for French people, etc. We know that in the province of Ontario we are beginning to participate in an exercise called race relations, as it affects aboriginal people. One of the focuses for our organization is to make sure that the right to the preservation of our language and the instruction of that language and, further to that, the correction of the history of our people in this province is going to take place and not be lip-serviced as it has been in the past. I would hope that this government will do what it professes in making sure that boards of

education preserve and work actively to preserve that right of language.

1550

I think it is worth while mentioning here, with respect to the attitude of Ontarians and the attitude of Canadians towards aboriginal people, that many of the public still believe that Indians are getting things for nothing, that we do not pay taxes, that we get this free and that free and all that sort of thing. Those myths must be dispelled, because they are not fair to us when people believe those kinds of things and treat us differently because they believe that, because they are not true.

Those rights that we want to preserve and re-establish are rights that were ours before any of the present-day government was here. When, 123 years ago or whatever it is, the first white man walked on this continent—and I think people have been saying this to you in different forums—we had our own government. The Canadian public does not know that either. How do you think people survived centuries on this beautiful island called Canada and in the Americas, how do you think we survived and kept the land clean and free without some form of government of our own? We want to recapture that kind of government and we would like Canada to recapture those principles and ideals of how we treat each other, with respect. We want to be unified on all of those matters, how we arrange ourselves, how we treat each other, how we deal with matters. The basis for those fundamental things is respect.

That is the kind of thing that ONWA has been fighting for, sometimes successfully and sometimes not, in the past. We are making it our business, when we are talking to our government representatives, our Indian leadership, that we want things right. We want things right for people no matter where they choose to live or who they marry or who they have children with. That is the bottom line for us. We want it recognized and implemented in local Indian governments.

Canadians have to realize, when they talk about Indians getting free housing and free this and free that—I think it becomes very clear when we talk about the eight out of 10 women who can expect to be abused in whichever way and when we talk about the effects of the residential school—we want to at this point congratulate Phil Fontaine for his courage. We understand that courage, because when we broke our information to the Canadian public it did take a lot of courage to stand behind something like this, when Phillip revealed to the Canadian public that there were all of those terrible things happening in the residential schools. Since that has broken, even within our own communities we can now talk about it. We can now understand why our parents have suffered and why maybe they are now suffering with alcoholism and all those other things, why people are in penal institutions. All of those things become very, very understandable.

So what does Canada do? What does Ontario do? I think the first thing we have to do is start to right the wrongs, and we can only do that together. Even ourselves in the Indian communities, we must do it together. We must work together at the community level and tell ourselves and each other what is right for our families.

I know I only had 20 minutes. I do not know where I am at now, Mr Chair.

The Chair: You are very close to that now, if you could sum up.

Ms Pierre: Okay. I think I would like to sum up, then. I think I was in the throes of summing up, that what is required for not only Canada and Ontarians but what is required for every province in this country to think about, is that we need that one central government, that we all, every province, every citizen in that province, must contribute, and we who live in the north and for those who live in the south, we must start to share more.

I am pleased that this government is trying to do that, that more resources will come to the north from our tax dollars. I am pleased that Canada will one day look to Newfoundland and the Atlantic provinces and say, "Here's how we're going to do it together," that, "The poor people in your province, we will help them." I am very proud to be living in Ontario, because I know that we do give a lot to the whole of Canada.

So with that, I think I would like to just leave the one thought that no matter who we are and where we live, we must shout the wrongs from every rooftop. Those things that are spoken in the dark must be spoken in the daytime. Those things that are hidden must become uncovered, and together, if we do this all in the spirit of what we were here for, why we are human beings, why we were put on this earth, when we all come within ourselves to understand that, then I think Canada will again become one of the leading countries.

I feel that we have lost something in the last while with Oka. We have lost much with the participation in the different wars, or a lack of participation, whatever it has been. I would like to thank you all for listening to me and I would appreciate hearing any questions at this time.

The Chair: We actually are not going to be able to deal with any questions, I am afraid, Ms Pierre, but I do want to say on behalf of the committee that I think the sentiment you have expressed, of the need to look at the many issues that you have outlined for us with a sense of respect, I think is something that the committee members hold very high as well, and I hope will be reflected in our report. Thank you for your comments.

Ms Pierre: If any of the members wish to communicate with our association after this whole procedure is over, we certainly do not mind sitting with people who can make changes in our lives at any time, so I would like to extend that invitation to any of you to communicate with our association and learn more about what we stand for and what we want to see for our future.

The Chair: Okay.

1600

MARY ROBINSON

The Chair: I call next Mary Robinson. While Ms Robinson is coming up to the table, I just want to announce again that there is a problem with the interpretation devices which apparently cannot be resolved until the setup is dismantled. There is one transmitter which is func-

tioning and if you are using the devices, if you aim the little glass or plastic ball at the end of it in that direction, that might improve the reception. That is a problem that affects only the people in this room. I am told that the transmission over the television set is proceeding as normal. Ms Robinson, go ahead.

Ms Robinson: Let me begin by welcoming all of you here to Thunder Bay and repeat what you have heard from a number of other people, I am sure, which is that it is a pleasure to see people coming to the north and giving us an opportunity to see you face to face rather than the usual flurry of paper which goes back and forth.

I want to begin by addressing first of all the issue of Quebec and Ontario's role in dealing with the role of Quebec in the constitutional process.

I should perhaps just back up quickly and advise you that I practise law here in Thunder Bay as a sole practitioner. I have a degree in political studies from this university. I have a degree, my law degree, from the University of Ottawa, which I am sure you are aware is primarily a bilingual university, although I myself am not bilingual, and have been practising law with a specialty in aboriginal rights here in Thunder Bay. I am also a sessional lecturer here at Lakehead University on aboriginal people and the law. So I have a particular interest in all of the issues which you people will be looking at and I want to start first of all with the issue of French and Quebec.

I believe the backlash we have seen with respect to this issue began with an unrealistic goal about a bilingual, bi-cultural Canada, that the difficulty really was that people did not understand from the very beginning that this was a project which is 100 or 200 years; this is not something we do in 10 years, 15 years or 20 years.

When I hear people say: "Look, we've spent all this money. We've put forward all this effort and we're still not bilingual," I look at the fact that French immersion in this city is probably not 20 years old, that the children who came through the French immersion programs are not yet in the workforce. They are probably just beginning to enter the universities.

The numbers in French immersion have been growing and growing and the interest in this has been growing. The problem has been that we try to go too fast. We want it too much and the goals have not been realistic. That itself has to be addressed. We do not just sort of throw it out because people say: "Oh, well, I didn't speak French. My kids had all this French in school and they don't speak French. It doesn't work. They're putting up French signs in the hospital. They're spending all this money and it doesn't work."

It may be that the government is indeed trying to put forward the symbols of bilingualism before bilingualism is really there and it may be that we have to put the brakes on on one side and have the sort of carrot and stick approach, if you like, which is to make jobs, put in place incentives for people to become bilingual, which again backlashes if there is no real need for the language in terms of numbers.

Now I am well aware that the circumstances are such that this occurs where numbers warrant, but that is not the view in the larger community. The view in the larger

community clearly is, "Well, everything I get is in both languages," and so on. I think what really has to be understood is that we need to settle down and prepare ourselves to spend 100 years doing this, that in the end we will be a richer province, we will be a richer country and we will be able to communicate with each other. We cannot expect to do it in this generation or the next one.

By residing in Ottawa and attending a university where, as I understand it, the only areas which were exempt from proficiency in both languages were law and medicine, I was surrounded by people who functioned in both languages and the advantage which it gave them, if for nothing else than scheduling classes. They could take a look and say, "Oh, well, I don't have to get up at 8:30 in the morning to take constitutional law because it's offered at 8:30 in English, but I can go at 4 o'clock in the afternoon in French."

I am also very aware of the people who are proficient in the day-to-day set of circumstances in both languages who found it extremely difficult to function in law, in something that was highly technical. The level of bilingualism that is required to practice medicine or practice law is much, much more than in studying in other areas, but notwithstanding that fact, there were a great many people who were very proficient, very able to do that. Those of us who had an opportunity who are unilingually really understood how much more they have than we do.

I guess the next point I want to make is that in our education system, I think another aspect that is missing is the value of languages, that languages is not merely being able to go into a store and buy whatever you want in either language, that languages are ideas, are the communication of abstractions, are the ability to talk to one another and understand what we are about, the nuances in the language.

I think the best example of that is the efforts to develop the PONA documents for the Ministry of education, the documents related to people of native ancestry, and what were they going to call it. One of the suggestions was "Touch a Child," but it would not translate in the nuance of the spiritualism of—"Touch a Child" does not translate. That works both ways with respect to aboriginal people. Many of the ideas, many of the nuances, the way they see the world, their holistic view of the world just does not translate properly into English. So as to people who have both languages, we look to them to interface for us in that respect. Sometimes even the interfacing just does not quite make it.

I want to turn from the question of the fact that the point I am trying to make, I think, is that we should not give up on bilingualism and biculturalism. We should perhaps just be a little more realistic about our goals and to communicate those goals and pursue them in a realistic fashion.

I want to turn from that to the Meech Lake accord. The Meech Lake accord, which would have granted a "distinct society" recognition to Quebec, is in my view merely stating the obvious. Clearly the people of Quebec are distinct linguistically and culturally and it is important to them for that to be recognized. I, for one, have no problem with that.

However, there is also the question of the French Canadian people who live in other parts of Canada. I think that Ontario's role as we go forward with constitutional talks is going to be to address that, because clearly if the separation of Quebec, or some form of sovereignty-association for Quebec or special status for Quebec, if you like, becomes a reality, the people, the French Canadians residing in other parts of the country by virtue of their geographics will not enjoy that same status. If we do it on a geographic basis, we are ignoring the fact that French Canadians reside in and have been a part of the history of this country from sea to sea. So I want to express the hope that Ontario in dealing with these issues will address that.

Meech Lake set as its priorities Senate reform, fisheries and all other matters. This brings me to the question of aboriginal people in the constitutional process, because one of the really serious problems, not that there are not a whole lot, has been fisheries.

You may or may not be aware, but the debacle we have in fisheries jurisdiction right now has to do with an 1897 decision of the Privy Council of Britain. They were asked about the separation of powers between the provinces and the federal government about who gets jurisdiction over fish. The Privy Council in all its wisdom said, "The federal government clearly has jurisdiction over fish, but the provinces own the fish."

We live with that to this day. When you add on top of that the whole question of aboriginal fishing rights, what you have is mass confusion and the circumstances which were up until recently, that a treaty right overrode a provincial law but not a federal law. So in arguing treaty law you had to look at all of these various bases.

The suggestion that somehow there was going to be constitutional reform on fisheries before the whole question of what are the aboriginal rights to the fisheries is incredible in my view, not sitting down and sorting out the rights of aboriginal people to fisheries in this country—aboriginal rights, treaty rights—before you look to the jurisdictional issue, or in the alternative, ensuring that aboriginal people have an equal seat at a table, because these are their rights which are being played with in the redefining of fisheries in this country.

1610

I think Ontario's role, again, has to be to speak out on these issues on behalf of the people of this province and the very large native population which we have. You will recall that in the 1981 constitutional talks which resulted in the 1982 Constitution Act, it was Premier Allan Blakeney who stood his ground on aboriginal issues. It is as a result of his refusing to step back that we have section 35 of the Constitution Act today, which entrenches the existing hunting and fishing and treaty and aboriginal rights of native people.

My question is, as we go forward and we begin the next round—we saw this in Meech Lake—who will be there speaking for aboriginal people? In the Meech Lake talks, no one at the table spoke for aboriginal people, without exception. No one stated: "Hey, wait a minute here. What are we going to do about the land claims while we

are divvying this up among ourselves? What do we really have to divvy up?"

So it seems to me that you will have to deal, first and foremost, with aboriginal land claims, comprehensive and specific. You have to deal with jurisdiction, hunting, fishing rights of jurisdiction, before the provinces and the federal government can sit down and divvy it up. You had better figure out what you have first.

This would bring me to Quebec. I think you will find few people in this country who are not anxious to see us hold this country together.

The Chair: Ms Robinson, I do want to let you finish, because you are going on to another point that we do want to hear about, but you are at the time already, so perhaps you would just sum up and touch perhaps on the point that you were about to.

Ms Robinson: Okay. I will sum up. The question of Quebec with respect to native people there: In the unhappy event that we make a move to sovereignty-association, that Quebec makes a move so that we cannot resolve this crisis, then I ask you, who speaks for the Cree in northern Quebec? Who speaks for the Mohawk? Do they go with Quebec or do they stay with Canada? I think they have stated very clearly that they insist on having a say. Is Quebec what was historically known as the colony, or is Quebec that which is now recognized as a province and what are the circumstances there?

I would say again to the politicians of Ontario that it will fall to you to speak for all of the residents of Ontario, and in doing that it will fall to you to speak for the aboriginal people, perhaps not just in Ontario but maybe even in the rest of this country, to make sure that these issues are addressed in a logical, rational manner and that the aboriginal people are not told, "Yeah, yeah, as soon as we get it divvied up among ourselves, we'll get round to you." It is completely unacceptable.

Much has happened in the last decade with respect to the law, and the federal government and the provinces have been dragged into the aboriginal issues by the Supreme Court of this country via various decisions on land claims such as the recent Sparrow case.

I think it is time for governments to take a lead and begin addressing this issue honestly and sincerely and not be dragged in by the courts over and over again, to set up a land claims process that is a fair and just land claims process that has representatives from everyone on it, to make money available to litigate if that is the decision of native people. They do not want to use this process. They want to use the court system. Right now they do not have that choice. The money is not available.

I thank you again for this opportunity and I hope you enjoy your stay in Thunder Bay. You certainly have lovely weather for it. You will be glad you were not here last week.

THUNDER BAY AND DISTRICT INJURED WORKERS SUPPORT GROUP

The Chair: I call next Steve Mantis from the Thunder Bay and District Injured Workers Support Group of Thunder Bay. Go ahead.

Mr Mantis: Do you want to take a break? Do you want to stand up? I would get really tired if I were sitting all day, I will tell you. I work in vocational rehabilitation and they say the best thing is get up and stretch. Seriously, take a risk. Just move a little bit, move your body, get the blood flowing. It helps the brain think. It does for me anyway.

Mr Winner: Do we have to pay for this?

Mr Mantis: Guaranteed this was free. No, you have to pay by listening, and putting up with taking a risk and maybe being a little bit embarrassed. I do not know.

First, I would like to introduce myself. My name is Steve Mantis and I represent the Thunder Bay and District Injured Workers Support Group. With me is Ross Singleton. Ross and I are both members of the board of directors and on the executive. We were approached to make a presentation to the committee and they said, "It's about the select committee on the Constitution." All right, so how does that affect us? I mean, injured workers are not in the Constitution. I do not think it says anywhere in the Constitution anything about injured workers, so what does this all mean? So we had to step back a little bit and think about it.

Well, how are we affected by the Constitution? Of course, the first thought is Quebec. Okay, this is all about Quebec, right. What does Quebec want to do? It is hard for us to really know what Quebec wants to do, but it sounds like it wants to have more control over its own destiny. Hey, more power to them. If that is what it is about, then we support a process that gives them more power over their own destiny, because that is what we are after ourselves and I would not want to make any judgement at all about what happens with the Constitution and Quebec that did not have some direct relationship on my life and the lives of the other people in our organization, and what we are is a volunteer organization that provides self-help.

We are injured workers and we see people out there getting screwed day after day, right and left, and we say: "What can we do about it? We'll help each other out." Honestly, that is the kind of Canada I want to live in. I want to live in a country where people help each other out. What does that mean in terms of a Constitution? I guess we have to have institutions that support that because, honestly, I do not think Brian Mulroney or the federal government or Bob Rae or the provincial government is going to solve my problems. It is too big. We need solutions which are generated in the community. We need people empowered to play a bigger role in their own lives and we need institutions and systems that support that.

I am not a psychologist—we do not profess to be, you know—but certainly our society has not been set up for people to take an active role in determining their own future. The first thing you learn is, you get in line before you go into the school building and you stay in line, and you do what you are told. So, like good people, that is what we have done. We have gone to the school and gotten whatever level of education and then we have gone to work. We have gone to work and we have worked hard, and then, you know, the Canadian dream is out there. We

want to own our own home, we want to have our family. So, following the rules, we go and get hurt, for any number of reasons.

One of the big reasons is because no one ever asked us how to make our workplace safer, and when we have tried initiatives, made suggestions, people have said to us: "That's not your role. I'm the boss. I'll tell you what you do in this job." "Okay, fine. I will listen to you. You are the boss."

What happened in so many instances, like you might have heard when you were in Dryden, we have a health and safety committee that is in there saying, "This is unsafe." They lodged two written reports. "This is unsafe." What happened? Nothing happened and the guy died. The next day it was fixed. Is that not something? I guess it got the boss's attention, eh?

What we are talking about is an institution, a system that does not support people's control over their own lives. The bill that was just recently put through the Parliament here, Bill 208, was a bill that actually had, in its original form, ways to implement that control. In the workplace it created a health and safety committee that had power. It had representatives from labour and management who could say: "Stop the work right now. Fix it." So we do not have to go to a committee. We do not have to take it through 20 processes. Fix it now, it is unsafe. We are going to have to fix it anyway; let's fix it now before someone gets hurt. That is one example of a solution that can work. Rather than having someone up here decide for all of us, let's filter that down. Let's have ways that people down here can have some control in their lives.

1620

Mr Singleton: Boy oh boy, tiring work. I hope this is overtime.

Mr Mantis: So when we look at the role of government and the role of the federal government, our suggestion would be a body that sets standards. Give the actual implementation and how those standards are put in place to the lowest common denominator if you can, so that what you do is you allow people in their own communities and their own workplaces and their own neighbourhoods to provide those solutions that they know are going to work. What happens is that people then get involved in the process.

What is the biggest problem today in terms of the whole political system? People do not trust it. When you have an election, what happens? People vote against the party. They are not voting for anybody; they are voting against the other guy. Why? Because they do not feel they have any control. They are not getting support they need to solve their problems. So let's find ways to give them the support. We are all just people and we all make mistakes, and whenever you have a small group of people making decisions, their mistakes begin to magnify.

The particular example is the workers' compensation system, which is what we are most familiar with. We have 2 Bloor Street East, downtown Toronto, on the 20th floor, where the final decisions are made. Now, I do not know what relationship that 20th floor is to a mine in Red Lake,

to a pulp mill in Thunder Bay or to a logging operation out in Hearst or Manitouwadge. To think that they are going to make choices that in fact are going to control a person's life down here, where you can see they make a mistake and there are 450,000 claims. All they have to do is make a mistake and that affects 10% of the people. You are pretty good, you are 90%, you are doing pretty good, eh? Ten per cent means you have got 45,000 people in trouble. Think about it.

So we want to find a way to decentralize that process. We want to find a way to create solutions that work for real people in our community. Our organization has lobbied governments but also launched a program of education. We feel that in order for people to take control, they have to know what they are talking about. So the flip side of people taking more control is providing the opportunities for them to gain the experience to make the right decisions. I think the process you have started right now is a step in that right direction, where we begin a bit more open-ended discussion around some of these things and they are not all left to decisions on the 20th floor of 2 Bloor Street East.

We have really been motivated in our organization by the suffering we see every day. I do not know if it is the same everywhere across Ontario, but here in the north we are heavy industry. People work hard. People leave school in grade 10 and they go to work in the mill and 10 years later they are making \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year. But they are working hard, and they earn their money.

The Chair: Mr Mantis, if you could sum up.

Mr Mantis: Once again, in summation, what I would like to do is pass out to you a bit of information about one of the initiatives that we are taking here in Thunder Bay. We have developed a proposal for a resource centre for injured workers, a place where people get information and find out where they are in the system, what is happening to them, where they get information about the resources that are available in the community and where they can have peer counselling, where they can talk to other people who have been through the same process and know what they are experiencing. The result of this is that people, instead of being beaten down by the system, begin to take more control. They get back on their feet. They get back to work, which is what they want. They want to get back to work, back into the mainstream, so that in a situation like this, everyone benefits.

I respectfully ask for your support when the stuff comes before you.

YVES ROBITAILLE

M. Robitaille : Je suis ici à titre personnel et je désire par la présente adresse émettre quelques réflexions relatives à la tenue de ce comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

La mise sur pied du comité dans le but d'émettre des recommandations sur les intérêts et les aspirations sociales et économiques de toute la population ontarienne au sein de la Confédération, ainsi que sur le genre de confédération qui pourrait répondre aux aspirations

sociales et économiques de la population ontarienne m'a semblé, à prime abord, une entreprise louable.

Cependant, permettez-moi de mettre en doute la crédibilité du processus entrepris ainsi que la crédibilité du rapport final que vous serez appelé à remettre vers la fin mars, et ce pour une raison majeure, le manque d'information.

J'ai été avisé de la tenue et des buts de ce comité le lundi 4 février par une circulaire émanant des bureaux de Nadeau, Beaulieu et associés. J'ai entendu, ce même lundi au CBON, un poste de Radio-Canada à la radio, qu'un comité Silipo siégeait à Kenora. J'ai vu et entendu à la télévision de Radio-Canada que ledit comité avait reçu les doléances et la volonté de la population amérindienne et des Ontariens anglophones. J'ai également appris par l'entremise de ces médias que le comité siégerait ce mercredi 6 février à Thunder Bay. J'en ai été sidéré. J'avais 48 heures pour me préparer à affronter ce comité et, toujours le lundi, 24 jours pour méditer, discuter, exprimer mes opinions sur des sujets d'envergure nationale tels que les valeurs partagées par les canadiens ou, quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada, ou encore, les volontés de la population ontarienne. Il me fallait réfléchir sur huit sujets primordiaux, sur des mots essentiels tels que «valeur, avenir, rôle, justice, place, province, autochtone», sur des thèmes politiques, sociaux, économiques, culturels.

1630

La vie m'a permis de faire des études et je pratique une profession qui incite constamment à la recherche et à la remise en question, et je me suis senti étrangement dépourvu devant les buts que vous visez. Je manque d'informations et j'ai l'impression de participer à une course à la montre pour des sujets d'intérêts nationaux qui invitent et suscitent la discussion, des sujets d'intérêts nationaux, je le répète, primordiaux, en ces temps où la Confédération semble ébranlée au plus profond d'elle-même.

Non, non, j'ai mentionné déjà et je le répète, votre entreprise m'a semblé louable. Votre comité aurait pu me pourvoir ; mais pourquoi avoir attendu si longtemps pour mettre sur pied ce comité, pourquoi tout à coup avoir organisé un rallye, un sondage peut-être ? Comment fut formé ce comité et pourquoi ? Nous manquons d'informations, rien n'est clairement défini, tout semble à la fois épidermiquement simple et profondément complexe. Quelle est la raison d'être de votre comité ? Pourquoi ne pas étudier les rapports des autres commissions pour ensuite les amalgamer ?

Non, votre comité n'est pas crédible à mes yeux et la crédibilité du rapport que vous serez invités à remettre l'est encore moins si on songe à d'autres commissions et comités qui elles/eux procèdent ou ont procédé pendant 12, 18, 24 mois. Et vous avez la prétention en deux, trois mois de recueillir auprès de la population ontarienne des renseignements sur des sujets primordiaux d'ordre national sans que celle-ci en fut très préalablement informée.

Le journal régional Le Nord a informé sa population de la tenue de votre comité dans l'édition du 30 janvier. Pourquoi n'avoir pas publicisé la tenue de votre comité ? La population aurait été beaucoup plus en mesure de

répondre à vos attentes. Croyez-vous que la masse populaire soit en mesure de paraître devant vous en sachant qu'elle a 48 heures pour se préparer ? Croyez-vous que la masse populaire soit en mesure en 24 jours, 22 jours aujourd'hui, de remettre, de préparer, de remettre des mémoires en 24 jours sans qu'elle n'ait reçu aucune information pertinente ? Enfin, ne croyez-vous pas que la population du Nord-Ouest ontarien risque de paraître indifférente aux yeux du reste de la province ? Et qui paiera la note ? Compte fait : l'Ontarien du Nord-Ouest. Je vous remercie de m'avoir écouté. Si vous désirez que j'apporte des précisions, je suis à votre disposition.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Robitaille. Je voudrais simplement dire que le rapport que vous avez mentionné et qu'on doit préparer pour le 21 mars n'est qu'un rapport provisoire. Ce n'est pas notre rapport final et aussi, comme je l'ai mentionné auparavant, nous voyons cette première partie de notre travail comme simplement la première partie d'une discussion qui doit continuer. Donc, nous sommes très conscients des points que vous soulevez devant nous aujourd'hui, du fait qu'il faut tenir encore beaucoup de discussions entre nous, politiciens, et évidemment les gens de l'Ontario.

M. Robitaille : Je vous remercie beaucoup.

M. le Président : Il y a une question, si vous voulez attendre.

M. Beer : Je me demande si, quand même, avec les explications du Président, ça peut être utile pour nous d'entendre quelques réflexions sur les problèmes, disons, auxquels la minorité francophone, auxquels les francophones du Nord-Ouest devraient faire face. Et, selon vous, qu'est-ce que nous devons ou pourrions présenter comme recommandations pour améliorer la situation des minorités, que ce soit des francophones ici ou des anglophones au Québec ? On a eu depuis quelques années des développements dans le domaine d'éducation, des services gouvernementaux, des services judiciaires ; qu'est-ce que vous pensez que nous devons faire comme province pour aider l'épanouissement du fait français dans ce coin de la province ?

M. Robitaille : Voilà, j'ai précisé au tout début que j'étais ici à titre personnel. Je ne représente aucune organisation, je ne représente rien du tout et vous me posez cette question-là à brûle-pourpoint, vous comprenez ? Et puis, je dois avouer que vous m'embêtez grandement parce que comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, si vous m'aviez posé cette question-là et si vous m'aviez donné le temps d'y réfléchir et d'essayer d'y apporter des solutions ou de vous en suggérer, j'aurais été très en mesure de répondre à cette question. Mais comme ça, à brûle-pourpoint, sans y avoir réfléchi, je préfère m'abstenir de répondre.

The Chair : I would like to ask the members of the committee if they would prefer to break for a few minutes. We still have a number of speakers to hear, and it might be useful if we take a five-minute break before we proceed.

The committee recessed at 1638.

1700

The Chair: Okay, we are now ready to go. I will go through the remaining list I have and call first André Cloutier.

ANDRÉ CLOUTIER

M. Cloutier : Honorables membres du comité de l'Ontario dans la Constitution, c'est avec beaucoup de bonheur que je prends cette occasion pour vous faire connaître quelques-unes des préoccupations qui m'animent en ce moment face à cette crise, puisqu'il semble convenir de l'appeler ainsi, dans laquelle notre pays et en particulier notre province se trouvent.

Je suis ici à titre personnel. Bien que j'ai oeuvré dans le passé dans des organisations franco-ontariennes, je n'y suis pas directement rattaché en ce moment. Par ailleurs, professionnellement je travaille ici à l'Université Lakehead en capacité de professeur de littérature et de culture québécoises et canadiennes-françaises.

Comme Franco-Ontarien, parce que c'est ainsi que je m'identifie, j'apprécie beaucoup l'attitude du gouvernement actuel de même que du précédent gouvernement face aux droits franco-ontariens. Je crois qu'au-delà de ce qui grouille et ce qui fribouille, comme le disait de Gaulle jadis, les gouvernements récents se sont montrés forts et ont indiqué clairement et fermement la route qu'il faut suivre. Je pense qu'un des messages qui se dégagera de ma présentation c'est que cette attitude constitue la voie à suivre dans l'avenir également.

Il me paraît fort ironique toutefois qu'au moment où l'Ontario assume présentement ses responsabilités dans les domaines des droits linguistiques et des minorités, le gouvernement fédéral montre une inquiétante tiédeur ou en tout cas, maintient un silence relativement beaucoup trop grand. Les problèmes linguistiques actuels que nous avons connus ici à Thunder Bay, par exemple — et dont on rappelait tristement le souvenir ce matin parce que ça constitue maintenant l'anniversaire d'une année — me paraissent avoir été engendrés, entre autres, largement par ce silence trop grand d'Ottawa sur une vision qui, il y a à peine 20 ou 30 ans, donnait naissance à une nouvelle vision harmonieuse de ce pays.

Faute de cette vision aujourd'hui, il me semble que nous sommes entrés dans un vide de leadership qui fait que tous les désirs de révision et de reprises deviennent possibles. C'est là un vide que l'Ontario s'est apprêté à combler et qu'il me semble l'Ontario, dans l'avenir, devra encore beaucoup plus fortement combler.

Je parlerai dans cette présentation surtout de la place qui me paraît devoir revenir au Québec dans une future Confédération, ajournée cette fois non pas seulement dans les mots, mais dans la réalité. Le présupposé de ma présentation en tant que Franco-Ontarien c'est que les Franco-Ontariens se porteront beaucoup mieux lorsqu'ils vivront à côté d'un Québec qui sera sur ses deux pieds et sera heureux de l'être au sein de la Confédération canadienne.

Ma présentation comprendra quatre points principaux. Je les affirme en partant et je les rappellerai à l'occasion.

1. Il me semble que, compte tenu des événements actuels au Québec et des nouvelles demandes, des demandes que le Québec a formulées, il ne faut pas dramatiser — j'insiste sur ce mot — les conséquences d'une décentralisation requise des pouvoirs du gouvernement fédéral.

2. Il me semble qu'il faut écouter le Québec et tâcher de l'accommoder par-delà toute tentation que nous pourrions avoir de mesquinerie, de jalousie, d'envie ou de rancœur que malheureusement on sent trop souvent chez certains de nos concitoyens.

3. Ce point en comprendra trois petits sous-points :

Le gouvernement ontarien, me semble-t-il, doit assumer un rôle de leadership fort dans l'édification d'un nouveau Canada. Pourquoi ? Parce qu'il me semble que le leadership éclairé et fort est le seul élément qui puisse élever les peuples et les individus au-delà d'eux-mêmes et de la tentation de mesquinerie, justement.

Aussi, parce que le rôle passé, historique de l'Ontario dans la facture où la fabrication du Canada tel que nous le connaissons a sans aucun doute été déterminant, le rôle de l'Ontario restera déterminant.

Le nouveau pays à naître doit commencer dans nos têtes. Et c'est là, je pense, le rôle du leadership, de créer un pays dans nos têtes, et c'est dans la tête de nos chefs que ce pays doit d'abord s'élaborer.

4. Les valeurs qui ont édifié notre pays et l'ont maintenu ensemble depuis quelques années et en fait, depuis ce siècle que nous venons de vivre, me paraissent aujourd'hui largement oubliées. Ces valeurs doivent être de nouveau formulées dans une vision cohérente et véhiculées avec force. C'était le résumé de ma présentation. J'en reviens au premier point.

Le nouveau Canada, tel que je le vois, me paraît nécessiter une décentralisation beaucoup plus grande que ce que nous avons connu jusqu'à maintenant. Je rappelle la position que je formulais. Il ne faut pas dramatiser les conséquences d'une décentralisation des pouvoirs du gouvernement fédéral. Et dans ce sens je m'inscris en faux, contre certains témoignages que j'ai entendus hier soir, entre autres venant de certaines gens de Dryden qui sembleraient scandalisés à penser que le gouvernement actuel à Ottawa puisse changer.

À cela je vais répondre que, en 1867, il y avait plus d'une recette pour constituer cette Confédération que nous connaissons. En fait, à l'époque la recette principale, celle qui a prévalu, jusqu'à un certain point, a été la recette proposée venant du Haut-Canada, du Canada de l'Ouest donc, de ce qui était l'Ontario, proposée par Sir John A. Macdonald, lequel voulait un pays extrêmement centralisé comme on sait, tellement centralisé que les Québécois de l'époque n'en voulaient pas.

Cette première recette de John A. Macdonald a dû être amendée. Ce n'est pas un pays absolument centralisé que nous avons eu avec des sortes de comités, de sous-comités provinciaux. Nous nous sommes retrouvés en présence d'un gouvernement central mais dont l'autorité était partagée par les législatures telles que nous les connaissons. Après 1867 nous savons, par ailleurs, que dans son évolution historique le gouvernement à Ottawa a

continuellement évolué vers la centralisation, un peu comme l'avait désiré, sans doute, John A. Macdonald au point de départ.

Cette centralisation, je le rappelle, a été appréhendée, crainte par Québec à l'époque. Cette centralisation, maintes fois, le Québec l'a perçue comme négative, l'a dénoncée, l'a combattue. Ce n'est pas ces récentes années, cela remonte à la fin du siècle dernier. Très tôt les Québécois se sont rendus compte qu'ils perdaient à faire partie du Canada.

Est-il nécessaire de rappeler les grandes crises à travers lesquelles le Canada est passées : les conscriptions, les guerres dans lesquelles le Québec a été invité à participer parce que le Canada a exercé un pouvoir centralisateur que d'aucuns peuvent juger excessif ? Cette centralisation, par ailleurs, qui a été négative souvent pour le Québec, n'a pas nécessairement été tellement favorable pour les francophones hors Québec.

1710

Donc, d'une part, le Québec semblait avoir perdu ; d'autre part, cette centralisation qui était sensé protéger les francophones hors Québec n'a pas été tellement profitable non plus. Une des raisons, c'est qu'un des pouvoirs du gouvernement central, le seul pouvoir qui aurait pu aider les minorités, ce droit de désaveu que le gouvernement fédéral avait, il ne l'a jamais exercé lorsque les crises linguistiques se sont posées au Nouveau-Brunswick. Lorsqu'elles se sont posées au Manitoba, le gouvernement fédéral a préféré ne pas agir.

Plus récemment, un geste excessif de centralisation me paraît avoir été posé par l'adoption de la Charte des droits et libertés. Je sais que c'est un peu une vache sacrée que de s'en prendre à la charte, cependant il faut reconnaître qu'à l'article de la « clause Canada », cette charte a eu comme effet de contraindre le Québec de façon à l'exaspérer et de façon peut-être à avoir suscité largement la crise actuelle.

M. le Président : Monsieur Cloutier, je m'excuse de vous interrompre, mais je dois vous dire que le temps à votre disposition est terminé. Je sais que vous avez encore beaucoup de choses à nous dire et la présentation serait sans doute utile pour nous. Si vous voulez nous en donner une copie, c'est certainement possible. Si vous voulez bien maintenant conclure.

M. Cloutier : Oui, merci. Je m'en vais conclure rapidement, peut-être résumer brièvement ce que j'allais dire. Est-ce que j'ai le temps de prendre peut-être deux minutes, une minute, trente secondes ?

M. le Président : Oui.

M. Cloutier : Après avoir parlé de cette recette qu'on a appliquée en 1867, et j'allais brièvement évoquer la recette nécessaire pour cette nouvelle Confédération de 1992 qui elle devra être faite de décentralisation, je pose la question : est-ce que c'est vrai que la décentralisation est de nature à affaiblir le gouvernement central ? Est-ce que la force du gouvernement central ne vient pas tout aussi bien de provinces qui sont fortes ? Je pense que l'exemple du pays voisin nous donne raison dans ce sens-là, de penser que ce n'est pas parce que les états sont forts que le gouvernement central est nécessairement plus faible.

J'allais aussi parler de la nécessité de faire place au Québec, de prendre au sérieux au fond ce malaise qu'exprime le Québec. Il me semble qu'au Canada, en général, on comprend mal ce qui se passe au Québec et je suis toujours, en tant que francophone, extrêmement étonné de voir qu'on puisse comprendre si mal le Québec.

Je pourrais peut-être dire que je ne suis pas né au Québec ; je suis né dans le Nord de l'Ontario mais j'ai vécu au Québec, j'ai étudié au Québec. Je crois comprendre les Québécois par l'intérieur, ayant vécu avec eux pendant plusieurs étés, pendant quelques années d'université, ayant lu leurs oeuvres aussi. Il me semble que beaucoup d'intentions qu'on leur prête ne sont pas justifiées. Il me semble par ailleurs que lorsqu'on ne tolère pas qu'on fasse à la minorité québécoise ce qu'on tolère tellement facilement que l'on fasse à la minorité française hors Québec, ces deux poids, deux mesures, j'avoue, me dépassent sans cesse. Même si j'essaie de comprendre mes concitoyens anglophones que j'aime bien, j'avoue que je suis dépassé par cette réalité-là et je pense qu'on touche là peut-être le problème majeur de la situation dans laquelle nous sommes, une sorte de fatigue émotive qui fait que le temps de comprendre semble être passé. Cela, j'avoue, m'inquiète profondément.

J'ai mentionné, et je vais terminer là-dessus, l'importance pour le gouvernement ontarien d'exercer un leadership. Je rappelle ce que j'ai dit au point de départ : je pense que les leaderships, depuis quelques années, se sont un peu attiédies. On semble penser que c'est passé de mode que d'exercer une force d'attraction vers quelque chose.

Je vais rappeler l'exemple de la guerre dans le Golfe en ce moment, qui a été malheureusement le résultat de l'exercice d'un leadership non pas pour la paix mais un leadership pour la guerre.

Une chose absurde dans un sens, même si une chose absurde est formulée, on voit que les gens ont emboîté le pas. Ce que je veux dire parallèlement, ce qui est très important, je pense, c'est que le gouvernement en place affiche ses couleurs, affiche ses convictions et que ceci soit lié au travail de votre comité. Il serait fort regrettable que votre comité se limite, ce qui est un risque, à consulter et à faire voir à tout le monde que l'Ontario consulte.

Il est très important qu'après cette consultation les politiciens s'alimentent des réflexions que ce comité fera et que cette alimentation devienne une vision qui s'exprimera avec force et qui sera de nature à tirer les masses vers un but.

Je crois qu'il est illusoire de penser que les masses d'elles-mêmes vont trouver ce but, à moins qu'on ne leur montre un but qui est censé être un but qui est intelligent.

Je pense que je pourrais m'arrêter là-dessus.

M. le Président : S'il vous est possible de nous donner une copie de votre présentation maintenant ou après ce serait, comme j'ai dit, certainement utile pour le comité.

M. Cloutier : Je peux peut-être mentionner que j'ai parlé à partir de notes et je m'en vais rédiger ces notes et soumettre une version définitive au comité. Je vous ai fait remettre une copie déjà dans l'état assez embryonnaire où se trouve le texte en ce moment.

Je vous remercie beaucoup.

ANN FISHER

The Chair: I call next Ann Fisher. Go ahead.

Ms Fisher: I am perhaps before the wrong committee. That may be the case, but your resolution here says "the social and economic interests and aspirations of all people in Ontario within Confederation." I wish to speak about the aspirations of the Ontario people in wanting to believe and in knowing that Ontario as a province has guaranteed its adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, albeit that it is outside of Confederation.

This province of Ontario has not guaranteed adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I come before this committee in order to let you know that the Ontario government, as did the previous Ontario government and the previous government before that, has abrogated its responsibility. The product that they abrogated responsibility on is a little, unknown quantity called tritium.

Tritium is used for all nuclear warheads. You cannot have a hydrogen bomb without tritium. Only the first-generation atom bomb, which was used in Hiroshima, did not contain tritium. Tritium, however, decomposes at a rate of 5.5% a year and must be replenished. All nuclear weapons contain tritium. Ontario Hydro produces tritium at the tritium removal facility. That tritium, instead of being placed into containers and being held, is being sold. You can sell it for \$29,000 a gram, and Ontario Hydro is selling it.

Premier Peterson in 1988 said, "The export of tritium is a federal responsibility." Albeit it is, but it is the provincial responsibility to decide whether it will be sold or not, and the Ontario government decided to sell it.

The select committee on Ontario Hydro affairs in 1980 said, "Although Ontario Hydro and Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd have programs ongoing to consider ways of further reducing tritium and carbon-14 releases, there is no national or regulatory framework for guiding their implementation." Further, Canadian Environmental Law Association, "There is virtually no provincial or federal regulation to ensure that exports and even domestic sales not be diverted to weapon use." Further, "Existing regulations fail to provide adequate environmental, occupation and public health."

The Ontario government is responsible for the sales of tritium ultimately. The Ontario government has allowed a monopolistic crown corporation to override the guarantee of Canada's adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty purely for the profit motive. If the province of Ontario would be willing to pressure Ontario Hydro, it could initiate a storage policy. After 20 years of holding and containing tritium, you can release hydrogen into the air because tritium decomposes.

I am no doubt before the wrong committee. This is a committee on unity within Canada. But if the Ontario government can abrogate such a responsibility, how can you have trust of the citizens to the government?

The Chair: Thank you. No questions.

1720

MULTICULTURAL ASSOCIATION OF NORTH WEST ONTARIO

The Chair: I will go then to Erica Rebernik from the Multicultural Association of North West Ontario.

Ms Rebernik: Good afternoon. On behalf of Peter Monks, the president of MANWO, I am making this presentation. Because of fog, he was unable to make it to Thunder Bay. I will be unable to answer any questions, but if you do have any, I will gladly take them back to Mr Monks.

Ontario is 1,068,580 square kilometres. Northwestern Ontario covers 50% of the land mass. While approximately 9,114,000 people live in Ontario, only 250,000 live in this area. Thunder Bay has the largest section of that population at 115,000. The area has about 34,000 native people.

MANWO is the regional umbrella organization serving the needs of the ethnocultural groups of the region. It has been doing so for over 10 years. The main objectives of the association are as follows:

To promote the concept of multiculturalism throughout northwestern Ontario; To facilitate for the cultural integration of immigrants and newcomers. To sensitize communities of cultural differences and work for cultural equality; to encourage cultural awareness, appreciation and co-operation among all citizens; to act as the chief advocate on behalf of multicultural groups in the region; to preserve cultural freedom, heritage and cultural identity for all Canadians.

MANWO serves as the regional resource centre for compilation and development of resource materials, disseminates information, promotes multiculturalism, organizes workshops and cross-cultural conferences and assists in the delivery of multicultural services to the ethnic community of the region. We have the following associations: Dryden, Manitouwadge, Kenora, Fort Frances, Rainy River, Red Lake, Terrace Bay and Thunder Bay. We are actively working in the following communities: Marathon, Atikokan, Geraldton, Longlac and Sioux Lookout.

What are the values we share as Canadians?

First and foremost, I believe we should never lose sight of the fact that we are all Canadians, no ifs, buts or notwithstanding.

Ethnic groups developed this great land. Lack of education, communication and sheer hard work forced closed communities. The world is ever changing and new immigrants are arriving. The population mix is in constant motion. New solutions, new opportunities are required to bring a harmonious expanding country into the 21st century.

Regional differences are as important to the peoples in them as the countries of origin. Very little credit or understanding is given to the urban areas of Canada; power appears to reside mainly in Ottawa and the various provincial capitals and governments.

What binds us?

If we lose sight of the fact that every person in Canada should be a Canadian, no amount of freedom and

democracy, diversity, monarchy or Charter of Rights and Freedoms will correct this. We are obsessed with the differences rather than the common aspects of good. This appears to be fostered by the government and the media.

How can we secure our future in the international economy?

Ontario contributes nearly 40% of the gross national product. People, we are informed, are the country's greatest asset. We continue to raise taxes at all levels of government, forcing every company, store and business to increase its costs and wages while negotiating free trade agreements that have forced too many companies into bankruptcy.

Many good people stand for public office but would appear to be corrupted by the political system. The rich seem to get richer and the poor get poorer, and the same analogy applies to the have provinces versus the have-nots. Northwestern Ontario provides the major portion of this province's wealth, yet a very small portion is returned to the area.

Is there ever such a thing as full employment? Tax burdens are ever increasing; takeovers, leveraged buyouts, all are out of the control of most people. Cheaper labour in the global market will also force many changes.

What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?

Fiscal responsibility is expected from our elected leaders. It is time that the ministers are held accountable for their policies and actions. If a company can be fined for non-compliance with the law or indeed an individual of the company may be sent to prison, why not the same accountability for the government?

The wealth of each province must be shared. However, this must be seen to benefit the community at large and not the lifestyle of the federal, provincial and municipal bodies. How can the federal government provide funding for a period of time and then arbitrarily cut the funding when it suits it.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? Meaningful discussions with the first nations' leaders. They have governed themselves in the past; they are capable of doing so again. Grant them dignity and respect as awarded to other heads of state. Settle just land claims promptly and as a priority. Provide education and training. Allow them control over hunting and fishing rights. Help them to develop and control the mineral rights and other resources.

What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?

MANWO has lobbied on behalf of the francophone community at the English-only resolutions in Thunder Bay. It also lobbies on behalf of all linguistic minorities to support the introduction of heritage language instruction in schools and to promote heritage language retention.

By promoting all heritage languages, the tension between the two official languages lessens. The first nations people are losing several irreplaceable languages and dialects. Rather than fighting the two language issues, we must preserve the priceless heritage of all languages.

Canada is officially bilingual; it is our duty to support that position. Thunder Bay has one of the largest Finnish populations outside of Finland, yet little is done for these hardworking people or for the Ukrainian, German, Polish etc.

What is Quebec's future in Canada? Six items are listed as distinct features of Quebec society. Many others could likewise list distinctive claims. Newfoundland was settled 910 AD to 1090 AD, mostly as a fishing base led by the Viking, Lief Erikson. John Cabot from Bristol discovered it in 1497 and Sir Humphrey Gilbert landed there in 1583. Newfoundland was a major influence in creating the Confederation of Canada in 1865, while itself not becoming a member for another 84 years.

The aspirations and goals of Quebec are to be respected and discussed. Meech Lake died because of the stringent deadlines imposed. Quebec is indeed a distinct society, as indeed are our native peoples. The latter have an older and much stronger claim to that recognition. Every province and people have similar claims; in pandering to one against another, further disharmony will result.

What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region? Some regions have long been neglected and have not been adequately represented. Lipservice from the elected leaders has been painful to many areas of the country. Canada without Quebec is no longer a country. The natural choice for the Atlantic provinces would then be to join the United States. That way they could at least benefit from the richer neighbour.

The west may well separate to the US as well, leaving only Ontario and perhaps Manitoba as Canada. The north would remain unwanted, undeveloped and unused unless there were minerals and oil in plentiful quantities—then the north would be claimed and wanted by all parties.

1730

Ontario's trading relationships: Free trade is inevitable. The European common market, the American-Canadian free trade agreement, the Pacific Rim trading groups—we have to be part of the world trade. There are significant barriers between provinces that are greater stumbling blocks than the trade agreements. The access to trades investigation revealed that people cannot practise their professions across Canada, only in selected provinces. Universal acceptance of qualifications and training is a necessity.

In closing, I would like to state that I am an immigrant. I came to this country 16 years ago, worked in Newfoundland for five years and have lived and worked in northwestern Ontario for 11 years. This country is one of the best in the world. We must stand and proclaim this fact. Together, we can make it a much better place to live in.

I have learned much in terms of racial tolerance and appreciation in the eight years I have been serving as a volunteer with MANWO. To combat separatism and negative comments, one has to stand and be counted. For this reason, I appear before the board.

Lack of notice and presentation time have made this presentation brief. I received details only last night.

This concludes Mr Monks's report.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Please extend our thanks to Mr Monks. The presentation may have been brief, but I think it covered a number of the issues that were raised in the discussion paper and then some, so pass our thanks to him for that. If he or your association wishes to send us any additional comments on any of those areas, we would be happy to receive them. If there is a copy of the presentation that you could leave with us, we would appreciate that. Thank you.

Is Rita Ubriaco here? I am going to go back through the list one last time and give people an opportunity if they are here to come forward: Brian Webster, Don Hudsell, Mark Powers, Brenda Reimer, Evelina Pan, Dave Pugh, Rita Ubriaco. Seeing that none of the individuals are here, I think we can recess and come back at 7 o'clock sharp. Oh, we are getting a few others.

I think, with the forbearance of the committee, if there are two other people, we can deal with them briefly. It is easier perhaps to do that now than it will be later on because our evening time slot is going to be very tight between 7 and 9 and we will not be able to add to that because of our schedule leaving out of here to get us to Sault Ste Marie.

BUD GARRETT

The Chair: Bud Garrett. Go ahead.

Mr Garrett: I am originally from Quebec and this French-English business does not seem right for some reason here in Ontario. I hear talk about how good the English have it in Quebec and how much better it is down there than here for the French, and it does not seem right.

Down there, if you want to know what is on your driver's licence, unless you speak French you have to get somebody to translate it for you. Up here, you can tell what it says on your driver's licence in French by looking at it. The schools down there have to operate in French. The road signs are all in French. There are a lot of things down there. The English do not have it as good down there, I think, as the French have it here.

But I do not think having laws to destroy the French language here is the way to go either. I think there should be laws throughout the country for both languages, and not only French and English, I think there should be laws for the natives languages too. I have got a son who speaks Ojibway not too bad, but since coming to Thunder Bay there is no school for him to learn his Ojibway so he is going to lose it, and I do not think that is right.

Another thing that bothers me, getting away from the French-English thing, is logbooks for truck drivers. It is okay for you to go to work for 16 hours and then drive home from work, and it does not matter how far away you are from work. You can work 16 hours, 20 hours, whatever, and then you can drive home. A truck driver can only drive 12 hours a day, and he is a professional driver. It just does not make sense to me.

Another thing that really bothers me are these fuel taxes we pay. The price of fuel here in Ontario is probably one of the most expensive in Canada. Not too long ago I heard on the radio that \$2 billion or \$3 billion in fuel taxes have been collected over the last couple of years and only

a small amount was put back into the highways. I do not think that is fair, either. That is what I had to say.

Ms Harrington: I just want to thank you for having the courage to come up and join us for a moment.

You mentioned that your son would be losing his Ojibway language because there are no facilities here. I just want to comment that that does show very clearly how precious language is and how very easily it is lost, both the native language and the French language. I think it points out that is how the people in Quebec are feeling, that unless there are barriers to protect their language, the language is lost.

Mr Garrett: I do not think anything should actually be protected. I think it should be fair. I think what we need is a fair system in which everything is protected, not just one thing. It should be that everything is protected. When you start saying, "We'll have a school here where we can learn Chinese," you are taking away from another language, or if you say, "Okay, we can only teach French here," you are taking away from the Chinese. It is quite a big thing altogether.

Ms Harrington: Language is important. Thank you for bringing that up.

Mr Bisson: I first have to commend you, as Margaret did. The wisdom we can sometimes get from listening to people who come forward and give their raw experiences with regards to what they see as failings within the system I think is something that we, as politicians, have to be exposed to more and more, because then we can be reflective of what society is all about.

I take it in what you were saying, though, what you are advocating—I am not quite sure, and this is why I want some clarification—is that what we need constitutionally is a system in which regulations and laws are the same in all provinces. You talked about transportation, you talked about language, you talked about a number of things. Is that basically where you are coming from?

1740

Mr Garrett: I think we need laws that are not always taking from something, for instance, logbooks. A guy cannot drive now. He can only drive for 12 or 13 hours, yet a guy can drive home after working 16 or 20 hours in a factory, and he can drive 100 or 200 miles and there is nothing wrong with it. I do not think that is right. It is definitely not fair.

Mr Bisson: So what you are saying is standard regulation across the country?

Mr Garrett: Yes, there should be something standard across the country, and there should be standard wages. A lot of people do not realize it, but truck drivers are still out there running for 22 cents a mile, a lot of company drivers. I have done it before, and it works out to about \$6.50 or \$7 an hour. That is it. People cannot feed their families on that.

Mr Bisson: I would like to thank you very much on behalf of the committee.

KEN KOOPER

The Chair: I call Ken Kooper.

Mr Kooper: I was reading the discussion paper, and it starts off: "A free society rests ultimately on the will of its citizens to stay together." Well, in this country I guess that is more of a challenge than a goal. I think the past couple of years is not really the only time this country has faced this same challenge. In the early 1860s we had this challenge. We have had provinces attempt to repeal their participation in the country. The problem is that we have now had 120 or 130 years in which we have stayed together, and with that has come certain attitudes that have developed in, I might add, a regional context, because I do not think this country has developed an attitude that is on a national scale.

In Ontario you hear the common attitude right now being, "Quebec has to become a part of Canada." What is Canada? It is a question we are still asking and we still have not got the answer for. It is almost like asking the question, "What is God?" We do not have an answer. In a sense, that is what we are getting here.

The problem in Quebec: You hear a lot of people say: "Well, Quebec. They want this, they want that." There are many separatists who believe that Quebec is a nation that can stand on its own and that it should get special status, that it has special status, that it is different. I am pulling out a book I use in my classes. There is an article by a noted professor, Craig Brown. He notes the words of John Stuart Mill, I think it is, in which he describes a common historical tradition for a national context. He is saying a historical tradition must exist for a people to feel that they are nation. He quotes: "The possession of a national history and consequent community of recollections, collective pride and humiliation, pleasure and regret, connected with the same incidents in the past."

A few minutes later, he writes: "Many nations have manifested their nationalism through great public acts. Canada has asserted its nationalism by looking for it." I assert that Quebec is not looking for it. They know who they are. If we look at the context of our collective heritage, our collective memories, what do we have? We have the Plains of Abraham. That sticks in our heads. What are the Plains of Abraham? The British defeated the French. Wolfe won a victory on a little battlefield and suddenly Quebec—or New France, because Quebec did not exist at that time—New France became a part of Canada. That is a very wonderful collective memory. I am glad we all feel that way. But somebody does not, somebody does not feel the same way about it.

A second collective memory: How about Louis Riel? Where does he figure in Canadian history? On the one hand, he is considered a traitor, and someone who was hanged because of it, with a great deal of opposition from the other side, which was Quebec. Whether the issues Louis Riel was fighting for were issues that French and English could feel, I do not want to get into. But the fact is that our collective memory of Riel is different in one part of the country from another. That is because in one part of the country we do not see the way the other part of the

country looks at things. It is kind of difficult, because we never felt what the other side of the country feels.

Right now, with all the feelings that are being aroused on one side or the other—English-only bylaws, I think, soured any emotions we have of bringing the country together on the one hand, and Quebec's language law, or its assertion that English signs can only be done in French, on the other hand, I think has soured our opportunities of bringing the country together.

In the next two years we have to step over that, and that is going to be very hard. I do not know if we are going to be able to do it. It scares me, because, personally, when Meech Lake was going on I never really supported it that much. I still do not. I supported the idea that we need to give Quebec a better place in Confederation so it protects its culture, its heritage, because otherwise, they will go on and do it themselves. They have a collective memory that is all of its own. They have a feeling about the Plains of Abraham and Louis Riel and conscription and every major crisis we have had; they have had one that has united them. We have not. I would argue that we are on the verge of never coming back together. I do not think we will. But we all have to be optimists. We all have to hope that this process will somehow manage to help bring it together, to heal the wounds.

For those people who believe we just can get rid of Quebec, that if Quebec leaves that is fine and dandy, they are dreaming. I do not think you could have a central government if one of the partners in the original Confederation left. It is a precedent. One of the things that, unfortunately, British law has brought with it is the idea of precedents. In the past 10 years, the first great precedent was that Quebec was left out of the Constitutional process in 1982. They did not sign the Constitution, and because they did not sign, that was a precedent. It is a precedent, but it is a precedent we all have to live with and one that every province can use. If Quebec manages to go on its own in the next two years, any other province can attempt the same thing, basically.

The Chair: Mr Kooper, could you sum up, please? We are at the end of the time.

Mr Kooper: Certainly. There are a number of things I wished to mention. First, I think that in this country what we have to do is try to change the tune, which is we just assimilate, assimilate, assimilate, and forget, forget, forget. We are different that way. We are really, in a sense, a bunch of little countries, regions, and it will be very difficult for us to assimilate, assimilate, assimilate one province into the country.

I wanted to make some proposals that I think could be useful. One thing is about the north. I believe the north should be granted provincial status within the next five years. That would be a good idea, and I think Ontario should be the one that pushes it in any future constitutional negotiations. Why? Because I think it is something that has been left up in the air in Canadian history. We have never really come to terms with it, and I think Meech Lake especially did not come to terms with it. And if we do not come

to terms with it now, we could have more problems on the horizon up north.

The Chair: Mr Kooper, you are going to have to end. I am sorry. We just do not have the time to go through the remaining points you have.

Mr Kooper: There is only one point left. There are a lot of people saying, "We should get rid of the Senate" or "We should keep the Senate." I think we should have an elected Senate, not based on the three diatribes from the west—the free, equal, whatever. I think it should be an elected Senate, voted two years after every federal election, like in the United States. That would give a balance, especially when you have a majority party in power. That would allow for people to have a second opportunity to make their feelings felt about the government in office at the time. That, I think, might create a balance and might bring about what would be a truly elected body of sober second thought.

To conclude, I hope that something does come out. I am scared, personally. I am torn, because I do not, in one sense, want to see Quebec separate, yet there are some things the Allaire report has come out with which I do not think we should accept either. Unfortunately, I do not have enough time to go through them. But whatever comes out, I hope Ontario will make a substantial position felt and that it will be an honest position, and that whatever Ontario does in the next couple of months to a year will bring the country back together.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Kooper. That concludes the session for us at this point. We will recess until 7 o'clock. We will try to get back here so we can start at 7 o'clock sharp, because, as I indicated, our time lines this evening are very tight. Thank you very much.

The committee recessed at 1754.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1913 at Lakehead University, Thunder Bay.

The Chair: I call this meeting to order and welcome those of you who are here in the audience. For the benefit of those people who are watching our proceedings over the parliamentary network, we are at Lakehead University in Thunder Bay. This is the third day of our hearings, the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We heard from a number of people this afternoon in a long session that went, I guess, for about four and a half hours or five hours, and we will continue our hearings now.

I want to say to the people who are here that, again, we are conscious of the fact that there are a number of other people who either were hoping or thought they were going to be on the list to speak. Because we are under some more severe time constraints this evening than we were earlier this afternoon when we were able to extend the time, we are going to ask those groups that are on our list to be, hopefully, briefer than the time they were given.

I am going to be as scrupulous as I need to be on that. I apologize for that, but it is the only way we are going to give as many people an opportunity to be heard as possible. So I would like to ask groups that are presenting, if possible, to keep their presentation to within 15 to 20 minutes and individuals to absolutely below 10 minutes. We are happy to receive any additional information you want to send to us following that, but it is the only way we are going to be able to give as many people as possible an opportunity to talk to us this evening, and because of the technical arrangements we need to end not much later than 9 o'clock.

THUNDER BAY MULTICULTURAL ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I will start then by calling Tony Pucci and John Potestio from the Thunder Bay Multicultural Association. Go ahead.

Mr Pucci: Mr Chairman and distinguished members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, on behalf of the board of directors of the Thunder Bay Multicultural Association, welcome to Thunder Bay.

At this historic moment when the destiny of Canada is at a crossroads, we recognize the extreme importance of our collective mission. Please appreciate that our brief that we will be presenting this evening has been prepared under extreme time constraints and without the benefit of the document A Public Discussion Paper, Changing for the Better. My colleague and past president John Potestio, in consultation with the executive committee of TBMA, has articulated our collective thoughts which Mr Potestio, sitting to my left here, will present to this committee this evening.

Allow me this opportunity to briefly outline the history of our association. The TBMA was formed in 1972 and has been a positive force since then. We have over the years taken countless initiatives, ranging from essential services to newcomers to the publication of a newspaper

called Northern Mosaic, conferences, etc. In recent years we have even established a centre in a refurbished historical building which is becoming more and more a focal meeting place for this community. In addition, for the last 18 years we have staged a yearly folklore festival which continues to attract and bring together thousands of Canadians to appreciate the richness of cultures which exist in this community.

We have a board of directors composed of 32 members and we represent, I would say, almost every ethnocultural group in Thunder Bay.

In summary, multiculturalism in Thunder Bay has been, and is, very strong. To put it mildly, we certainly would like to see a greater commitment to multiculturalism at the federal, provincial and local levels. A manifestation to this effect is imperative at this historic time when we are poised to enter a new era.

I would like to turn the mike now to my colleague here and past president of the Thunder Bay Multicultural Association, John Potestio.

Mr Potestio: Thank you, Mr Pucci. Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to thank you for the opportunity of giving us, TBMA, an opportunity to present our views on some very important issues.

As the umbrella organization of the ethnocultural groups in our community, TBMA is concerned about the constitutional impasse in our country and all its ramifications. We are now at the crossroads of redefining not only the way the various parts of our country relate to each other, but of charting a new social and political order that could serve as a blueprint for the future.

TBMA is well aware that the people of Ontario, as well as other Canadians, are engaged in a debate, often bitter and divisive, about the very nature of our country. Last year, about this time, the council of the city of Thunder Bay precipitated an acrimonious debate on bilingualism that set back relations between anglophones and francophones for a long time to come. TBMA entered the debate and subsequently made a plea to the council members to rescind that motion. I urge the committee to read the appendix at your own leisure that is included in the package.

TBMA has tried its best to bring people in this community together to work for a more tolerant and equitable society. We of course realize our limitations, and we also understand that the national mood is such today that conciliation and compromise are difficult to achieve, perhaps because Canadians do not understand what is happening. We can see the results of a country that is out of joint. The list is long: Meech Lake, Oka, crippling parochialism, language intolerance, racism, discrimination and economic hardship. But we do not know the source of our malaise.

It is time, therefore, that we stop relying solely on our political leaders for answers—not that they should be excluded from the process of nation building—and examine our own consciences and engage in intelligent discussion. For a start we should attempt to appreciate the fact that

most of our problems stem from a historical tug of war between anglophones and francophones, each trying to define Canada in their own image to the total exclusion of native and other ethnocultural groups.

1920

In a brilliant analysis of this problem, one of Canada's most eminent historians, Ramsay Cook, put it this way: "Canada suffers from divergent concepts of the nation and the state. Whereas English Canada has traditionally acted on the principle that 'Canada ought to be a culturally homogeneous country,' and has used the state machinery to effect this perception, French Canada thought of itself as already being culturally homogeneous, that is, they were already a nation, and that in the words of their great leader, Papineau, 'One nation ought not to govern another nation.'"

We in the multicultural movement believe that Canadians should embark on another course by abandoning the concept of the two founding races and adopt a policy of cultural plurality that is the essence of multiculturalism. Canadians should not define the nation state in terms of the cultural aspirations of one group or the other. Instead they should use the state to promote the equality of all ethnocultural groups.

In other words, we may have to give up the 19th-century definitions of nationalism and adopt a more progressive, relevant and uniquely Canadian concept of the nation state as the embodiment of those values and traditions that have evolved historically as people from the four corners of the earth have attempted to improve their lot in this land of promise. The state should use its considerable resources to foster a sense of Canadianism that is defined by geography and a common destiny, by political and social institutions and by a value system that is consistent with the aspirations of all human beings, regardless of cultural background.

If we strengthen institutions that serve people and empower all Canadians to exercise some control over their lives, nationalist aspirations of the English or French variety would become unnecessary. Indeed, Ontario as the most populous and perhaps the most economically influential province, has the obligation to remind the two so-called founding people, the French and the English, that neither one is culturally homogeneous and that for the sake of national unity they must cease their attempt to establish a cultural hegemony over this land by using the tyranny of the majority, to use a hackneyed phrase.

Ladies and gentlemen, TBMA recommends the following:

1. As the most culturally diverse province, Ontario should take a stronger stand in the promotion of multiculturalism as the only real alternative to anglo or franco conformity.

2. The government of Ontario should make more effective use of the constitutional powers that can effect desirable changes in the structure of our society. For example, education should be used as a more effective tool to eliminate interethnic, intercultural and interracial strife by the creation of support and accountability systems which would ensure the full equality of all citizens of this province. The vertical mosaic must become the horizontal mosaic.

3. By using the educational system, the government of Ontario must promote the concept that all cultures and languages have intrinsic value and implement programs which will enhance our linguistic and cultural heritage; for example, mainstreaming heritage languages and greater commitment to collectors of archival resources and publications of ethnic and multicultural materials.

4. Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the government of Ontario should strengthen the institutions that promote equality for all citizens, such as the Human Rights Commission, for example, to create a democracy of talent and merit rather than one which relies to a certain extent on patronage and historical and cultural pedigree.

Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Questions on the part of the committee members.

Mr Beer: It is nice to see you again in perhaps calmer times. In the recommendations that you make, I wonder if you might talk a bit about the work of your council, both in terms of interracial issues, because I believe you have been looking at a number of issues, and in terms of one of the ones that of course is raised with us, the aboriginal question, as to what your sense is of where we are there and the kinds of steps that we should be taking and also a community such as Thunder Bay has been taking to bring about better harmony and dialogue.

Mr Potestio: If you would not mind, Mr Beer, I think maybe Mr Pucci, as the current president, would be in a better position to answer that than I would.

Mr Pucci: I think that the feeling of the multicultural association on this question has been in essence to encourage a speedy resolution of outstanding issues with the native community. I do not think that we have any easy answers to that, but we would encourage the two levels of government to get moving with that big job. I think that is what we have been advocating.

Mr Beer: Just briefly, do you sense there is a climate there that would allow that to happen, would permit that to happen, that people have the sense that now is the time when perhaps we can resolve some of those issues?

Mr Pucci: I believe that is the perception I have of our communities, that there is a genuine interest in seeing these issues resolved with the native people. There is a genuine feeling of that, I would say.

Mr Potestio: I certainly would concur, though I would offer another comment, and that is that perhaps the board members are—I am going to be perfectly frank—more concerned with the relations between the English and the French in this country and issues on bilingualism as opposed to native issues. That is not to say our board does not discuss, talk about native issues and the way these issues should be resolved. I think the board is very sympathetic to the problems that the native people of Canada face today.

Mr Malkowski: I was very impressed with your presentation, but there is one point I would like to clarify. The establishment of the Human Rights Commission, you say—do you feel there should be more representation from

the multicultural community and do you see that there needs to be a reform of the Ontario Human Rights Commission structure?

Mr Potestio: I guess the point I was trying to make is that instead of identifying ourselves with nationalist issues as we have been all along, whether we are pro-French or pro-English, I think it is time to think about strengthening the institutions that make us Canadians. You know, what are we proud about? I think that in this country we are proud of the fact that we believe in freedom and equality, the equality of ethnocultural people, equality of race and equality of the sexes.

I am not sure about the structure of the commission, but I would imagine there would be room for more representation in ethnocultural committees, although I do not have the list in front of me, but I have a hunch that there should be more representation as well as perhaps more women. But the point, to go back to what I said earlier, is to strengthen our institutions that make this society work.

Ms Harrington: You were discussing just recently the values that we share and I think that is the first question we had in our discussion paper, that we as Canadians have to look at the values we share. Also, the last speaker we heard before our supper break was dealing with the experiences that we share in a common history and how we value our experiences together as a nation.

The point I wanted to note was the fourth topic you brought up about strengthening the institutions that promote equality, such as the Human Rights Commission, and changing things so that our democracy does not rely, as you say, to a certain extent on patronage and historical and cultural pedigree. I just want to let you know that this is something our government is very committed to, as you may know, that we want to change the perception that in the past it has relied on maybe who you are or where you are from, that we want to bring everyone together into sharing power, not concentrating power but bringing it to everyone.

Mr Potestio: I guess our hope is that whatever the next book, it will not look at Canadian society or Ontario society in the ilk of Porter, that the next book will say that Canada is not a vertical mosaic with the two so-called founding races at the top, but is a horizontal mosaic where we share equally in the mechanisms that make this province work. As a multicultural society, we need more appointments to boards. We need more representation to, let's say, university boards, for example, trusteeship. I think we have done a sufficient amount, but not enough, and I think that is the basic point we are making.

1930

Ms Harrington: We cannot change everything overnight—

Mr Potestio: Of course.

Ms Harrington: —but we are totally committed to that.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. It has been useful to the committee.

Mr. Potestio: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

AIME BOUCHARD

The Chair: Could I call next Aime Bouchard, grand chief in the Lake Superior area to come forward. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Bouchard: Good evening, Mr Chairman. I am not used to calling anybody "Mr Chairman." I have about nine pages that I would like to read. I did not have a long time. I did not know that I was coming up here until maybe a couple of days ago, so I just wrote this out today.

The Chair: Before you start, if you prefer to do that, then go ahead and do that. Again, just because of the time constraints that we are under, if you are able to—

Mr Bouchard: I will read fast.

The Chair: Well, the other option would be, we have the brief, and if you want to pick out from it things that you want to highlight for us, that would be also helpful.

Mr Bouchard: Okay, so we have only what, about 20 minutes? Okay, maybe I will—oh, I will read it.

To go deep into the history of native and non-native relationships will not serve the purpose of this presentation, yet it is the most important part of why we are here today, and I truly believe that it should be taught more in depth to students in the school systems if Canadians are to truly understand the full fabric of this country.

At present our country is in the Middle East, as allied forces are trying to drive Iraq out of Kuwait with the excuse that we are helping to enforce a new world order which has come about by the United Nations agreement, and we are enforcing a resolution to that effect. Yet Canada is a signatory to the convention of indigenous people and many of their resolutions within the United Nations. Where is the new world order?

Many people in this country and within the government say we have given the aboriginal people of this country too much; it is time they pay their own way. "We pay their education, their health, their housing. That's enough," they say.

Why is it then that we have the poorest education, the highest death rate due to poor health, not to mention that we have the poorest housing in Canada? Why must the native people have to live in these Third World conditions while the rest of the Canadian society lives in luxury and makes huge profits off land that belongs to the aboriginal people of this country and indeed all of North America?

I am not saying that all of the people of this country live in luxury and profit from our land. We recognize that there are poor and desolate non-natives who are very much in the same position as we are. But the negligence of their government to provide for them is not why we are here today. That is another issue that will change with a more socialistic, a more caring society and a more educated and helping society.

It is true that Canada is changing. The government is finally recognizing that consultation with its people must be made, that respect of the environment is essential for the development of this country, that poor people deserve the respect and dignity also, that people when properly consulted can lead to better government as opposed to a

handful of politicians taking it upon themselves to decide what is right for us.

Government in this country is starting to learn what we have been telling it for the last 200 years. Their philosophy of governing is starting to come in line with how native people have governed themselves, with respect to their land and resources.

We know that business plays a major role in Canadian society, to create employment and pay for various government functions, but it must be done with respect to the environment, the people and the resources. This too is beginning to happen, although in my opinion it is not happening fast enough.

Is it wrong and does it make us unable to govern ourselves because we believe in respecting our environment? Because we do not believe our people should have to pay to be healthy, to be educated, to be assured of adequate housing. Ensuring these are basic human rights. These are rights everyone in this country and in the world should be assured of. These rights should be the government's main function.

I cannot explain within the time allocated all of the topics that should be discussed in this forum, but instead will try to generalize my thoughts and not get into specifics.

Indian nations within Canada made agreements with the government of this country. These agreements, which are known as treaties, must be guaranteed and entrenched within the Canadian Constitution.

The education process must take place showing the true history of this country, not the romanticized cowboy and western version where the Indians were savages and the non-natives were saints trying to civilize the aboriginal people.

This education process must start in the elementary schools and continue on through the post-secondary school level if the average person is to understand and accept the changes that will have to take place. This process will also eliminate the ignorance on the part of the dominant society about native people, to their role in the rich history of our country.

Self-government is a right that all people in this world have and it must be recognized and acted upon as the United Nations Convention on Aboriginal Rights has agreed upon, to which Canada is a signatory.

We are not asking that Canada give us self-government in a legislative form which will dictate our ways to govern. We are asking that you recognize that we are a self-governing people now. We have always been self-governing, because if we were not, we would have been assimilated a long time ago. Your policies, your programs have only been roadblocks that have hampered our development in exercising our self-governing rights. The only reason that native people have maintained what language and heritage and culture we have is because we knew that when government wanted to extinguish our race, we exercise our self-governing bodies, and we are here today to prove it.

I would also like to say that although we are Ojibway or Cree or whatever, we do want to be part of Canada. We just want to be Ojibway or Cree first, to have the sovereignty to maintain our language, our culture and our heritage.

When we speak of land and resources, we speak of enough land under our control to maintain our way of life for the people whom we have who want to continue to live in the traditional ways, so that they would be able to hunt, fish, trap and gather, and maintain sacred burial and ceremonial lands. This is land that may see no development, or only be developed at such a time as when technology can assure that there will be no environmental damage.

We also look at co-management of other lands that must take place for the economy to develop and prosper. But this must be done with respect for the environment and with respect to the people who are immediately affected by the development, whether they be natives or non-natives. Co-management of hunting and fishing and in conservation must be achieved, because the way it is now with the Ministry of Natural Resources doing it, exact and clear data cannot be achieved without the native people's participation.

It is our belief that our treaties guarantee us the right to hunt and fish. If those guaranteed rights are to be kept, then there must be greater control in those policies by native people.

Native people must be directly involved in developing policy that affects them, if not developing those policies themselves. We cannot depend and rely on government-appointed committees to do this for us; with the processes that have taken place in the past, nothing significant has happened.

In September 1850 a treaty was signed by the Ojibways of Lake Superior and William Robinson on behalf of the crown which conveyed certain lands to the crown and retained certain lands. The lands that we had retained, we have never surrendered. This must be recognized by the government, and through bilateral discussions, a resolve of this issue must take place and happen, aside from any policy on land claims. The government must recognize that the treaty with the Ojibways of Lake Superior, more commonly known as the Robinson-Superior area, dealt with us as a nation in 1850 and it must also deal with us as a nation today.

We cannot be forced because of policy and restraints by your government to have to belong and depend on a political organization in southern Ontario to represent our interests. The Ojibways of Lake Superior must be dealt with in the same scope as other political territorial organizations with respect to education, health transfer, economic development, policing, child welfare and all other issues that affect us.

We must have direct control of our affairs so that our regional governments can become a reality, to resolve the mess that the Canadian governments have created on our people and and in our communities.

1940

While I am here, I must say something about social services. We have over the past five years been developing unique child and family services for our bands in the Robinson-Superior area. It is called Dilico.

Dilico's philosophy is quite simple and concentrates its efforts on preventive services. We believe that many of the child welfare problems that exist can be overcome by

preventing the situations before they happen. We also use counsellors, psychologists and a variety of professional people in our programs.

At present there is the integrated services for northern children program that we have been trying to access. This program provides professional services to northern Ontario children who experience a wide range of problems. ISNC was developed by the ministries of Community and Social Services, Education, Health, Northern Development and Mines. Comsoc, which co-ordinates this program, refuses to go on to reserves and so the Indian children must go to other communities to receive these services. It is my understanding that because educational services are included in this program and education is perceived to be a federal responsibility, these services cannot be brought on to reserves. I do not see this as a jurisdictional problem but one of discrimination against first nation people. It is situations like this that cannot be allowed to happen if this country is to function effectively. If the problem is one of policy, then change the policy.

I will close by saying that I hope through this process a better understanding of governments and first nations will occur and substantial change will take place. I have much faith in this New Democratic Party that is now in power in Ontario to assist and help first nations in their long struggle for justice. We can make Canada a place for all people, be they native, French, English or any other minority, but there has to be dialogue.

With that, I would like to say thank you for your time, but I would also stress that this process must continue and not stop here. More specifics must be presented. Meegwetich.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Bouchard. Certainly I think, on behalf of the committee, I would agree with you that the process needs to continue and we will be looking for ways to ensure that does in fact happen. There is one question from Mr Winninger.

Mr Winninger: You certainly presented the issues very clearly and persuasively, Mr Bouchard. I just have one question regarding a paragraph that appears on page 6, in the middle, where you have recorded the fact that certain lands were never surrendered. "This must be recognized by the government, and through bilateral discussions, a resolve of this issue must take place." Are you talking about discussions between the first nations and the federal government or the provincial government, or did you mean to suggest both?

Mr Bouchard: Well, it would be nice if both could agree to it. It does not matter to me. If Ontario owns the land and it is willing to recognize that it got that land illegally or through some fraudulent process, then I will deal with the province. But the fact is that the first nations in this area need land.

Mr Winninger: Thank you for answering that.

The Chair: Mr Eves.

Mr Eves: I do not really have a question, but rather a comment. I want to thank you very much for the presentation that you have made before the committee this evening. I think that you have helped to educate a lot of

people in Ontario by participating in this process this evening. I make reference specifically to your points about mutual understanding and respect, and I think that the points you make on page 4 and the bottom of 6 and top of 7 of your brief—I think Canadian politicians, regardless if it be at the federal or provincial level, often fail to understand that we cannot dictate to native people in a government process and system that is ours and only we understand, and we do not appreciate yours and that of other native people. I think if we were all educated better to that process and we had that mutual understanding and mutual respect, we could make not only the province of Ontario but indeed the country of Canada a lot better place to live.

Mr Bouchard: I think you are right.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Bouchard.

MARGARET WANLIN

The Chair: I call Margaret Wanlin.

Ms Wanlin: Good evening. An important part of my concept of Canada came in 1967, our centennial year. I was a youngster then, perhaps naïve and impressionable, but none the less inspired. Here are some of the messages I got then about our country: Canada is the most wonderful country in the world. We are a mosaic of different people living happily together. Our country was born out of compromise and conciliation, not violence and war, because after all, we had decided that we could come here and live comfortably together. We are different, dare I say better, than the United States and we are beginning to cut the ties with our British parent, getting ready to stand on our own adolescent legs.

Adolescence—maybe that is where we are now as a country. I am sure we all remember examples of our own obnoxious adolescent behaviour. I have a friend who says that he wishes the science of cryogenics, freezing people, had been farther along, because he would have taken his 13-year-old daughter and put her away and brought her back when she was 20. She was a much nicer person then.

Adolescent behaviour can often include questioning almost everything, trying to find the edge on how far we can really go, being egotistical and self-centred, being disrespectful and inconsiderate of others and not expressing to those around us that we really do care after all.

It sounds too familiar in a national sense, does it not? Well, how do we grow up and what kind of adult country do we want to be? Here is my six-step solution.

First, we must develop mechanisms which can cope with change and can change themselves. Clearly our brand of federalism does not work any more. Witness the recent childish episodes in the Senate and the gamesmanship we have come to expect at question period. We need political forums for sharing ideas and building solutions, not ones where every idea, whether good or bad, will just naturally be criticized by the opposition because that is its job.

The Yukon is developing such a non-partisan forum and we need more of those in Canada. We need to look at examples of other places where that is being made to work. The European Parliament is an interesting example. If countries as diverse as Portugal and Britain can solve

problems and develop new institutions, surely British Columbia and Quebec could join in such a process. The Scandinavian countries too have elected to co-operate where co-operation is necessary and to preserve their uniqueness where uniqueness matters.

Second, we must walk a mile in the other man's moccasins. I mean that regarding native people, but also Quebec, the east, the west. In some ways, in this part of Ontario we are almost in the west. Kenora, for example, is closer to three other provincial capitals than it is to its own in Toronto. We feel too that sometimes—hopefully not too much—we are not understood by central government either. It is so important that government ministries and crown corporations are aware and engage in meaningful dialogue with people in various regions.

In the last few years, decentralization of Ontario services has brought many government agencies to the north. It is a great step and we are glad to have them, and keep them coming. So this dialogue that must happen must consist not only of what we want out of the system but must also include emphasis on what each community contributes and what its aspirations are. Meaningful problem-solving can happen best when the groundwork of real understanding is in place.

Third, we must see our country in a global, not in a national, context. The world is changing rapidly. We must try to understand what is happening and react accordingly. The evidence is becoming stronger and stronger that we cannot maintain our standard of living by relying on extracting and primary processing of our natural resources. Some of that work will likely continue, but not enough to sustain us. We need to understand the global context. We need to train our people for technological change and for information work. As a middle power, Canada has an important role to play on the global scene. As a non-aligned peacekeeper, we can make important contributions. I think we are slipping a bit on that score lately.

Fourth, we must face the facts. Does it make sense that Canadian iron ore and coal can be mined, shipped to Japan, made into steel, shipped back to Canada and sold here cheaper than we can make it? No, it does not make sense, but it seems to be happening, and not only is their price better, but also their quality. We must take a hard look at our international competitiveness. We must reduce our debts. The cost of servicing the debt is causing governments to be hamstrung. Canadians feel they are paying high taxes and yet governments have almost no money for discretionary activities which can help us to cope with these massive changes. Likely that means cutting services—unfortunate but necessary.

Fifth, economic co-operation among the provinces must be strengthened. Economic glue is probably the most powerful kind that there is, yet Canada has not ensured that there is a maximized amount of it. Imagine the illogic of setting up a free trade agreement with the United States while leaving up many interprovincial trade barriers. That seems highly destructive of east-west ties and reinforces the value of north-south ones. It is essential that in a variety of ways provinces collaborate and co-operate, and economic co-operation must be high on the list.

1950

Sixth, we must develop a new sense of national purpose. The old one—"we are not the US; we are different"—is wearing thin. Exercises such as this are part of that process. We must sift through until we find what that purpose is and then celebrate it. Ford did it. They said, "Quality is job one." That concentrated their attention. So did Hertz. They said, "We try harder." I mean more than an advertising slogan; I mean something that strikes a responsive chord in our people. Peace, order and good government used to mean a lot, but it needs updating now.

You have asked some specific questions, and I will respond to those.

1. What are the values we share? The new answer to that question must be divined through a purpose-setting process as defined. For me, the key values are that we are a variety of people who have come here, mostly voluntarily, to start a new life, along with the aboriginal people who have been here for centuries. We are a peace-loving people who choose to either ignore or understand our differences, but in either case we collaborate rather than fight in solving our problems and addressing our opportunities. It may be a bit of wishful thinking there, but none the less—

John Kennedy was right in his famous line when he said: "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." It is time we started considering the common good and our part in creating it, not the individual or small-group good and how to get the best share of it.

2. I have spoken to question 2 on the international context already.

3. What role should the federal and provincial governments play? I believe you need to rewrite the question: What role should the federal, provincial and municipal governments play?

Municipal governments are closest to the people, and they are therefore the most accessible and accountable of all governments. Municipal governments should be set up in the Constitution so that they have a real set of powers including some way of raising funds other than property tax. Responsive government is the whole key. Municipal government is the best form of grass-roots democracy.

I believe in a loose form of federalism, where communities and provinces have the ability and the responsibility to develop their uniqueness while national standards are in place in key areas. National standards are required regarding health care, education and possibly now, in these days, also the environment. But after that, the provinces and regions can implement programs in their own way.

Canadians should have a comparable level of public service, but I do not know how to get Alberta, for example, off its kick about sending out billions more than it gets back in federal services. I am sure there are no perfect formulas, but valiant efforts should be put into finding near-perfect ones to look at how to pay the federal bills.

I am sure we could benefit from studying other federal systems: Australia, the US, Switzerland. Let's learn from the experience of others as well as our own. Argentina might be an interesting study. It is an example of how a

country went from a First World country to a Third World country. Let's not choose to follow their lead.

4. How do we achieve justice for aboriginal peoples? It is time to allow aboriginal people decision-making powers over their own destiny. Clearly, our paternalistic method has not worked well enough. Two issues are of the utmost importance: first is developing a workable form of self-government on the right-sized tracts of land; second, placing major emphasis on education of both adults and children. This is absolutely necessary so that native people can participate meaningfully in our economy.

5. What are the roles of English and French languages in Canada? I believe there is room in Canada for two languages. It works in many other countries; it can work here. While bilingualism should be encouraged and state-supported, it should not be shoved down people's throats. A one-size-fits-all policy just does not work. That is especially true in the parts of the country where the percentage of other languages is low. Northeastern Ontario, for example, with 28% French-speaking people, needs much more attention in the bilingualism sense than northwestern Ontario with 5%.

Language is a very sensitive subject. Sensitivity and respect are particularly necessary. Inflamed rhetoric does not help on this already emotional issue. I support the idea of Canada being officially bilingual. I am less sure if that official status is beneficial for Ontario, but definitely in French-speaking areas provincial services should be available in French.

6. What is Quebec's future in Canada? Clearly, Quebec is a distinct society in the Canadian context. While BC and Alberta and all other provinces are special, they are not as distinct. Distinct societies should allow for provision of a unique culture. It should not mean a way of getting a disproportionate share of the economic resources. I believe that such a distinction as I have just made should be hammered out and officially recognized in our Constitution. We have to work at this. I believe that real recognition of a unique culture would be very meaningful to Quebec, and I believe that this could be done in such a way that it is not done at the expense of the rest of the country.

7. What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic? I believe the west has some legitimate concerns about its place in Confederation. They are right: Senate reform is needed, and Quebec should not be allowed to veto it. Stronger alliances in the west and the Atlantic provinces may make their voices stronger and their political clout more convincing. Clearly, "Ontario first," or Ontario arrogance, have got to go. I do not mean that we should roll over and play dead, but I do mean that we need to listen, to learn and to problem-solve.

8. What does Ontario want? I would add to that: What can Ontario contribute? It is essential that people talk to people in the process of developing common goals. Ontario should be a catalyst for that process here and in the country at large. While this forum is useful, it is not people talking to people. In the days of the Liberal minority government, the Liberals and the New Democrats worked together to draw attention to northern Ontario issues in a way that had not been done recently. The Premier's confer-

ence on business and entrepreneurship involved 1,000 northern Ontario citizens in the process of determining their own future in a series of 14 regional workshops and a conference. It was grass-roots participation, people talking to people, people finding their own solutions to problems they share in common. That model could apply on Canadian constitutional issues as well.

There is a principle in organizational behaviour that leadership flows to those with the competence to exercise it. Ontario has an opportunity to provide leadership, not because we are the most populous or the most powerful, but if, and only if, our leaders can develop a vision of the country which can capture the imagination of Canadians, in Ontario as well as beyond our borders.

Ontario should put in place a system so that citizens are more meaningfully involved and feel more connected to the economy. Foreign and absentee ownership and control are rampant, particularly in northern Ontario. Quebec has developed a very interesting model for involving its citizens and stimulating the economy by making share purchases tax deductible. A system such as this could be useful in Ontario in helping us understand the realities of the economy and the costs of government.

In conclusion, we face a very serious but not hopeless situation. I believe that there is a bit of a renaissance happening in Canada, and if that rebirth is encouraged, stimulated and fostered it can be part of developing a new sense of national purpose and some common denominators and rallying points for our citizens. It will not be easy, but most truly worthwhile efforts are not. It is important. Let's give this wonderful country our best shot for all of our grandchildren.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Members are asking whether there is a copy of the brief that you can leave with us.

Ms Wanlin: Not here, but I will send you one.

The Chair: Okay. We will also have it available through Hansard for members of the committee. Thank you very much.

2000

LISE BIBEAU

The Chair: I will call now Lise Bibeau.

Mme Bibeau : Je suis ici aujourd'hui pour parler de la place des francophones dans la province de l'Ontario et au Canada. Les francophones ont leur place non seulement dans la province de Québec, mais partout au Canada. Trop souvent, les francophones canadiens sont traités d'immigrants indésirables d'un autre pays. J'aimerais préciser que le Québec n'a jamais été souverain. Il faut souligner qu'il y a beaucoup d'entre nous, des Canadiens français hors Québec, qui ne sommes pas nés dans la province de Québec. En fait, ça fait des générations que nous sommes ici en Ontario et dans les autres provinces. Notre place n'est pas dans le Québec mais ici ou n'importe où que nous désirons vivre dans ce vaste pays qui est le Canada.

Un des exemples le plus facile que je peux noter est celui du Vieux Fort William. La langue du peuple la plus

parlée parmi les blancs était le français et non l'anglais. Les coureurs de bois étaient francophones. C'étaient quasiment seulement les partenaires de la compagnie qui se parlaient en anglais; les langues de choix étaient les langues autochtones et le français. Il est certain que si nous regardons les noms des premiers blancs qui sont passés dans la région, c'est des noms français que nous voyons. Même les villages et les lacs ont des noms français et je vous donne comme exemple Longlac, la ville et le lac, Pays Plat, une réserve à l'est de Thunder Bay, Lac Seul, un lac au nord de Dryden. Nous pouvons être certains d'une chose : ce n'est certainement pas les Anglais qui les ont nommés ainsi.

Nous avons été traités de la même manière que les autochtones, notre langue a été bannie dans les écoles et si un enfant avait le malheur de s'exprimer en français, il était puni. Cela montre que les Canadiens français ont été parfois assimilés de force, comme les autochtones. Quand un enfant reçoit des coups parce qu'il parle sa langue, c'est grave. Je ne connais que deux groupes de personnes qui ont été traités ainsi au Canada : ce sont les francophones et les autochtones.

N'oubliez pas que si nous aurions eu nos écoles de langue française tout le long de notre histoire, nous n'aurions pas seulement un demi-million d'Ontariens et d'Ontariennes qui s'identifient comme Canadiens français, mais probablement plus d'un million et demi.

Même aujourd'hui, l'éducation en français est rationnée. Je vous donne comme exemple la ville de Thunder Bay, où une personne doit s'identifier comme catholique et laisser faire éduquer son enfant dans la religion catholique même s'il n'est pas pratiquant, pour venir à bout de faire éduquer son enfant dans sa langue maternelle. Ce problème n'est pas unique à cette ville, je vous assure. Je sais que la discrimination basée sur la religion est contre la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés. C'est malheureux que le gouvernement du passé et celui en pouvoir présentement n'ont pas vu clair pour mettre fin à cette honteuse forme de discrimination et également pour contrer le phénomène d'assimilation des francophones.

Si nous oserions suggérer que nous désirons assimiler un autre groupe de personnes aujourd'hui, il y aurait fureur terrible et tout le monde crierait que nous empiétons sur leurs droits, et c'est pour cela justement que nous nous demandons pourquoi il est toujours correct d'assimiler les francophones de cette région, de cette province et de ce pays.

Nous sommes citoyens de ce pays depuis le commencement de l'histoire des européens sur ce continent. La plupart des Français qui sont venus s'établir ici n'avaient pas d'allégeance à la France, car les paysans de France comme ceux d'Angleterre n'avaient pas de grands droits. Si leurs parents avaient allégeance, les enfants en avaient rarement pour la simple raison que la France n'était qu'un nom pour eux et leur réalité était sous leurs pieds, la terre de leur naissance, et c'est cette terre qui leur tenait à cœur et c'est la même qui nous tient à cœur aujourd'hui, un pays parmi les plus grands du monde, qui s'étend d'un océan à l'autre. C'est pitoyable qu'il y ait des personnes qui ne voient que leurs petites régions sans tenir compte de

l'histoire du pays entier qui fait de nous des Canadiens, pas des Américains, pas des Anglais, pas des Français, mais des Canadiens.

Comme Canadiens, nous avons le droit de nous identifier par nosouches, en disant que nous sommes Canadiens français, Canadiens finlandais, Canadiens italiens etc. On ne devrait jamais avoir honte de ces racines, mais il ne faut pas oublier que nous sommes Canadiens avant tout. Si nous l'oublions, il manque vraiment quelque chose. Il manque peut-être l'esprit d'être Canadien, la fierté d'être Canadien. Il ne faut jamais oublier que nous avons presque 400 ans d'histoire. N'oubliez-le pas ; ne la tirons pas aux vidanges. Même s'il y a eu d'autres groupes de personnes de d'autres pays qui sont venus par après, nous ne pouvons pas changer notre histoire pour leur plaire et nous ne devrions pas changer notre histoire pour ce qui fut de nos contributions à ce pays. Il n'y a aucune raison pour laquelle nous éraillerions les droits des peuples qui étaient ici depuis si longtemps, les autochtones qui étaient les premiers, les Canadiens de souche française qui ont suivis et les Anglais qui ne sont venus qu'après être déplacés par nos voisins du sud.

KAREN LEE

The Chair: Next, Karen Lee.

Ms Lee: I would rather not sit. If it is all right I will stand. It is easier for me to sign. I am deaf, was raised deaf. I am a single mom. I am also native. I have grown up in the north and been a northerner all my life. I am here to talk about both interpreting and deaf group homes in the north.

I have been on a variety of committees. I am president of the Canadian Hearing Society board, and a member of the Thunder Bay Centre of the Deaf, on their board. I have sat on a variety of committees in a variety of capacities. I also sit on a barrier-free committee in this locale that deals with issues for various disabled people, and there are a lot of other things I have been very actively involved in.

I wanted to come here to talk about interpreters in the north. We have only one interpreter in the north and there are all kinds of interpreters in the south. I do not know how the MPP sitting here got six interpreters. It is a shock to me. I do not know where he found them all. I think that we in the north need to have support so that we can have access. It has to be in place in law so we are able to hold that law up and say we have a right to interpreters' services.

I also think we desperately need a deaf group home in the north. Down south there are all kinds of services. There are deaf group homes all over in various southern cities. In the north there is absolutely nothing, and we have continually fought for those services. We need to establish a group home for all of the people who live in the northern regions so they can come down to a place such as Thunder Bay. We need to have deaf professionals, and I notice that in the north all we ever get is grant money for contracts. In the south you get deaf professionals, but we cannot attract people up here because all we get is contract work. How can we possibly get any deaf people who are professionals

to move up here to provide services such as deaf group homes if all we ever get is grant funding?

We do not match with the south. Our values are very different. We cannot go down there to get services. It is not where we belong. I am a part of the north and I want to stay up here.

I think that is all I really wanted to say. I know I only have a few minutes, and it was very last-minute when I was asked to come and speak. As you see, I do not have any papers. I do not use English, I do not write English very well. That is why I need an interpreter and that is why we need to set something up here. Interpreter services were only established in 1985. Before that, I would go to committees and there would be no interpreters. I would be completely left out. I had heard about interpreters, but none of them came up here, and there are a lot of deaf people up here. We have to have a law in place that will provide that service for us. I hope that all of you sitting here today can help support the issue of access in the north.

2010

The Chair: If you wait a second, I think that there are some questions.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I wish that Gary did have six interpreters. Unfortunately he only has four. Gary has the same problem in trying to obtain interpreters. I just want to say something of a personal note, that I, like probably most people in this province, knew very little about the issues surrounding the deaf community because I was always isolated from being there. I have had the pleasure for the past number of months of working with Gary and finding out a lot more about deaf education in general, but a lot more about Gary.

I guess what I have to say to you in some hope is to realize, and I am sure you know that because you know Gary, you have one heck of an advocate here in the caucus. Gary has done a lot, I think, for all members of the Legislature in understanding this issue. I think that when you personalize an issue to the sense where you can really appreciate what needs to be done, maybe then we can start moving forward. To me, I think what I am trying to say personally in words is kind of difficult because it is somewhat emotional for me, because Gary is my buddy here, right Gary? He did acknowledge that; I was wondering.

I think the thing is that what happens is that you start to understand that there are differences within the society on a number of levels, on a number of different people that make up the society. I guess what I am trying to say is that by learning about other people and their differences, we get to really build their selves, and at the end of the day we become a much more tolerant society and feel a lot better about doing the type of things that need to be done and going on with building this nation of ours. So you have a good advocate here.

Ms Lee: Very nicely said.

The Chair: Thank you, ma'am.

Mr Malkowski: I want to thank you also, Karen.

LAKEHEAD UNIVERSITY NATIVE STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION

The Chair: I am going to proceed to call some people who were added to the list on the understanding that we would get to them if there was time. I am going to ask them to be as brief as they possibly can because I know that there are probably other people in the audience who also would like to talk to us and we would like to leave some time as well for that.

If I could call him then, Paul Nadijwon is from the Lakehead University Native Students' Association.

Mr Nadijwon: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. We were given rather short notice to come here, so I am not sure how well prepared I am to speak on some of the issues. I think one of the things I would like to do, first of all, and this will not take very much time, is to discuss the relationship of native people with governments.

To our understanding, it seems to be that we are still in this colonialistic relationship and we have been very hard pressed to maintain our sense of identity, our culture, our language, our heritage. But it seems that the native people themselves are not the only ones who understand these things. There have been researchers and various other forums where these things have been discussed previously.

To give an understanding of this relationship I would like to read a quote that somebody by the name of Milan Kundera wrote: "The first step in liquidating a people... is to erase its memory.... Before long a nation will begin to forget what it is and what it was. The world around it will forget it even faster."

This is the feeling many native people have. We are not looking for a tolerant society; we are looking for a society that understands exactly where we are coming from.

Another individual, an anthropologist by the name of Diamond Jeness, in 1954 travelled across Canada studying various native communities and towards his conclusion of his book he wrote, "In every region I found a deep-rooted prejudice against them, a prejudice that was stronger in some places than in others, but one which was noticeable everywhere from the Atlantic to the Pacific." This is something many native people feel is definitely a reality.

Going to a speech that Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau gave on 8 August 1969 in Vancouver, part of that speech goes as follows, "I think Canadians are not too proud about their past in the way in which they treated the Indian population of Canada and I don't think we have very great cause to be proud."

Last, from Justice Hartt, who sat on the northern commission on northern affairs for the White Dog and Grassy Narrows reserves, part of his statement went as follows: "Their presentations gave me an unforgettable sense of their frustration with the inability of the federal and provincial governments to work together to ease their desperate situation." And another quote from the same individual: "The native people value their traditions. The land is not simply a place to live. It forms a symbiotic relationship with the people and the animals which cannot be wrenched apart without serious consequences."

Part of my reason for being here, I suppose, is because I do very strongly maintain a cultural identity, as you can

see by some of the things I have on here, and I chose to wear these things this evening because I wanted that to be recognized. I am not ashamed to wear long hair. At one point I wanted to become an Ontario Provincial Police officer, but I was refused because of my hair. We know that is different today, but I am sure there would still be some difficulties in those situations.

One of the reasons we have maintained an identity is because of this isolationist social experiment that the government has imposed on native people by forcing them to reside on reservations, and because we still have a number of elders, especially in this part of Ontario, who have never been to school and have never been to church. They can only speak their native language. They have maintained a very high profile culturally. Their language is so sophisticated that we cannot even understand them sometimes because we have adopted English. So sometimes even we have a difficult time speaking with our elders.

There are about 27 issues that were listed on some papers I received regarding things that we may wish to comment on. I cannot stress the importance of some of the differences between native views and non-native views. First of all, I suppose, whenever we look at the way whites would describe words, for instance, their language, it is always information and facts. For every word that we look at, and when we translate these words, we have to look at our culture. That is the only way we can get an accurate reading.

Now, as far as the justice system is concerned, we feel that it is very difficult to be treated fairly in a system which we feel already kind of has us earmarked the first moment we step into a courthouse. I have worked as a court worker and I have visited very many penal institutions for the purposes of support and various other things. But when I look at some of these issues that are listed here, many of these things are very important, and it all comes down to money.

2020

From my perceptions as an academic and as a native person who is part of the system, both the Canadian and native society, my perception is that Indian people are big business and big money. They are big money to the legal system, they are big money to the administration and bureaucracy of this country and they are big money due to the resources that are tied up in the Canadian Shield and in other locations across Canada. We have not had access to the development of some of those lands, nor have we had much of the benefit of the moneys that have been secured through those resources by large corporations and companies. So when we look at our education and some of the money we receive to attend post-secondary education, we feel that is a very small price to pay.

There is also a lot of difficulty in getting money at the right time. Our grants usually come in at the beginning of a month, and meanwhile the landlord is making phone calls and various other things. I think the government has a pretty good idea how many students are in school. At least for those students who are in school, they should not have to worry about getting money on time. It is hard to build

up credit or respectability with landlords and other bill collectors when you are not getting your money on time.

The Chair: Mr Nadjiwon, perhaps you would conclude.

Mr Nadjiwon: Okay.

The Chair: It is getting to the end of the time.

Mr Nadjiwon: All right. In conclusion, I hope that some of these issues will be considered and kept in mind when dealing with native people.

MARVIN McMENEMY

The Chair: I would call Mike McMenemy now.

Mr McMenemy: I would like to start off by saying that my legal name is Marvin McMenemy and I have a nickname Mike. I would kind of like it specified, because I would not want my father getting in any trouble on one side or my nephew getting in any trouble on the other side for my views.

Actually I would have preferred if you had brought out something on insurance, for their no-fault insurance in the province rather than this, but we will have to live with what is here. Because our no-fault is a mess; you are just a victim if you get hit.

I would like to start off by talking about Meech. It is something that when Meech was in, we were operating by two sets of rules. The people in Quebec were acting like the alcoholic or abusive father in a family situation, where he operated by one set of rules, could dish out anything he wanted and the other side was supposed to make like the abused wife and kids.

If you spoke up and complained about some of the weaknesses in the way it was being treated, you were called a racist, a bigot, a redneck, that you hated the French. I cannot see why one group is allowed to speak out and dish anything they want and the other group is not allowed to speak up for itself. It is something, I think, that with the battle on the Plains of Abraham, when the French lost, their first threats started arriving then. It was either give us our language and our culture or we are headed south. That is when they started and they have kept continuing.

A lot of stuff to do with history is not taught in schools and some of it tends to be rather biased in the way it is taught, but very little of it is taught. In the First World War, conscription was a problem with Quebec. In the Second World War, conscription was a problem again with Quebec. The French almost brought the government down at the time. They had ghost squads running ahead of the conscription people, you know, letting them know so they could run in the bush and hide more or less. The people who did from Quebec in most cases were zombies. I will admit the Vandykes and the Vandoos were a couple of groups that were there, and from what I hear there were natives and everybody else mixed in with them that were more or less French-speaking. You did not have to be of French descent to fight with either of those groups.

Something that might sound kind of crude is when the French would not fight in the Second World War, the allies being counted the United States, Britain, Australia and

New Zealand. They fought to liberate France, fought to liberate Europe and I think everybody knows what happened with France. The Maginot Line went down in two days. After that went down, they lasted about four to six weeks.

It is something right now the way we are having English forced on us—or French forced on us in this country. When you come to talking about language, there are different ways language can be brought on a people. Right now the people in France would be talking German if it were not for the allied countries that got together and liberated Europe. There is stuff like that that is not taken into consideration with the way things are going.

When it comes to environmental factors, there is James Bay hydro electricity. It is the same thing here; there are two sets of rules. The French people of Quebec are wanting to flood out all of northern Quebec, land that was not theirs originally, build hydro dams, flood the Inuit, the natives and everybody up north, just flood them out. They do not want environmental assessment hearings. Yet on the other hand, how do you think the French people of Quebec would feel if English-speaking Canada decided to dam off the St Lawrence, flood it out, and anybody that bobbed to the surface talking French or English with a French accent no longer lasted; it is something. It is two sets of rules again and it is not right.

When it comes to other environmental stuff, it ties in partly to Quebec where with their reform choice, the Al-laire report, one of the things they want complete control of is environmental stuff. When it comes to environmental stuff, I saw a documentary on Country Canada the other day that tied into nuclear waste, tritium, being dumped on a regular basis from a hydro plant. They have an industrial park in the same area. With the industrial park, there are many toxic wastes in the area. This also happens to be in a farming area and there are many pesticides and fertilizers.

When it comes to the government of Quebec, it seems to think nothing is the matter. They are willing to put stuff like that on the people to line their pockets, kind of not worry about the people, "We will just line pockets." It seems of no concern to the government.

In a newspaper article I saw a while back, it came to—you will have to pardon me, I am not very well organized. Anyhow, basically it is to do with toxic wastes in Mexico. Two companies got together. They wanted to get involved with toxic wastes in Mexico to clean up the mess. Part of the thing that tied into it is they wanted to build a disposal plant. If they build a disposal plant, it will be built somewhere here in Canada.

Part of the problem that arises with this is that the Minister of the Environment for the federal government is out of Hull, Quebec. Anything where there is money involved, somebody is willing to build something. They can go to all the provinces. Somebody can be funded with backing the same way they got these things. You know, the plant is put in somewhere.

By the way the hearings go, they have to be pre-notified and acknowledged and accepted before the waste can be brought in. So the federal government could more or less bring a toxic waste thing in, set it up in one of the

poorer provinces and through Hull, Quebec, the federal government would be okaying anything that is brought into the country with nuclear waste.

It comes with all the industrialized countries. They refuse to bring in toxic waste from other countries and I cannot see how people will go through something like that; it is again money. It does not matter how low they stoop or what they do, but they want their hand in.

There is other stuff tied into that. I am off topic here. When it comes to the federal government right now, the three major parties are willing to give Quebec anything it wants to get the bloc vote out of the country. With that bloc vote, they have kind of got control. With the other provinces now, with the added parties, the vote is being split.

It is just kind of terrible the way other people in Canada, in the majority of cases, in the Second World War, especially with the natives, who were the highest percentage who were out fighting for Canada, but when it came to the people from Quebec they would not fight. They basically stayed home and bred to increase the population to control the country by a vote. I do not think things like that are quite appropriate.

2030

The Chair: Mr McMenemy, I think we are trying to be as open minded as possible about allowing people to express their opinions, but I think there is inherently something we need to do when comments like the one you just made are made, which, aside from anything else, are not even accurate, historically at least.

Mr McMenemy: Well, right now, they have something going on in Quebec—I am getting off topic again—where they are paying \$3,000 for every child after the second one.

The Chair: In any event, I also wanted to tell you that your time is pretty much at an end, so if you would like to conclude.

Mr McMenemy: That was no 15 minutes.

The Chair: We trimmed the time to 10 minutes, unfortunately, in order to allow as many people as possible an opportunity to speak. I made that announcement before you came in, I guess.

Mr McMenemy: Are there many more people after me?

The Chair: Yes, there are a few other people after you.

Mr McMenemy: Because I was told my time was for 8:30 and that I had 15 minutes from there.

The Chair: I understand that you were told that. You were told that because you were on the original list. That is why I went back to your name once I knew you had come into the room. You can take a couple more minutes and conclude, and we will go from there.

Mr McMenemy: When it comes to multiculturalism and federal bilingualism, it is kind of a crock between the two. Multiculturalism is retaining your own language and culture. The way we have it here in Canada with federal bilingualism, it is having a language forced on you,

basically the same way Russian was forced on the East Germans when it was a Communist-bloc country.

When it comes to free trade, we are supposed to be able to compete with the United States, yet when it comes to having all the books done in two languages, it is very expensive.

When it comes to some other stuff dealing with that Allaire report, there are things pumping money into the province where nothing is going out. Apparently, just after the fish plants got shut down, there was a very small—about an inch by an inch and a half—article in the paper, where a third of a billion dollars was given to Quebec fisheries after canning plants and other things were shutting down in the other provinces. The fishermen were complaining about quotas put on them. They are taking from the poorest parts of the country. The federal government is willing to give them anything.

It came up that there was a fishery investigated. The stuff that was happening there is not quite appropriate, when they are willing to take from the poorest parts of the country, when they get involved in something like that.

When it came to spending in this country, when you go back there is a 25-year balance sheet. In that time, Albertans sent Ottawa \$100 billion more than the feds spent in the province. In the same period, Quebec received \$91 billion more than what Ottawa got. When it comes to the other provinces, the west as a whole paid Ottawa \$54.7 billion more than it received. Ontario took in \$8 billion, while Quebec came out \$100.5 billion ahead.

The federal government right now, to get the bloc vote out of Quebec, does not care: the rail repair contract out of Winnipeg, the aircraft maintenance out of Winnipeg. The country is virtually being ripped apart and given to the people of Quebec for the bloc vote.

I do not think it is appropriate and I think it is time English-speaking Canada started to decide it is not being treated fairly and speak up. I have spoken to a lot of older people in my lifetime. When it comes to people who fought in the Second World War, I enjoy talking to them and listening to them and listening to their complaints. They say stuff like I am talking about is the type of stuff they talk about at the local Legions. People who were willing to fight for this country, it meant something to them. My grandfather fought in both the First World War and the Second World War; too young for one and too old for the other.

The country means something to us. It should be something that is like a family situation: you cannot take one child and give him everything and cut back on what the others get and expect the family to be satisfied. It is the same thing as what happened in Oka this past summer. In the city involved, the people did not want the other nine holes of the golf course. In 1959 they said, "We are just going to build access roads on to the golf course." Along with building the access roads, by the time they were built the golf course was built. So the people at Oka this time decided, "We are going to block the entrance road on to the reserve." That is all that was blocked originally.

The mayor and the QPP decided they were going to use force to put the natives down. What happened there

was that they found out how much power the natives had because they had fought in wars and stuff like that. Force was used when it should not have been. Like any good dictator, Mulroney sent in the army, then he went into hiding. I do not consider it appropriate, when there are people who were willing to fight for this country, as the natives were, who are treated like that, as if we are in a dictatorship.

I am sorry I have offended a few people here, but if anybody wants to knock any of my facts I am willing to listen.

Mr Harnick: Can I just ask one question?

The Chair: No, I am sorry. Mr McMenemy is at the end of his time.

Mr McMenemy: Okay. Well, thank you for your time. I am sorry about offending you, but there are two sides to every coin and every story.

The Chair: Our efforts are trying to find, in fact, what those common bridges might be so that we can deal with those—

Mr McMenemy: Well, there are times in marriage when there has to be divorce. The way Quebec is wanting from the rest of Canada, it would be the farm, the house, the car and everything, and the firing squad for hubby to make sure he did not steal anything on the way out.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

PETER VANDERKAM

The Chair: Could I call Peter Vanderkam.

Mr Vanderkam: I have prepared something for you. My understanding from this piece of paper is that this a policy position and decisions that may affect quality of life in the province. Seeing that you are provincial, this is what I would like to address.

The point that has been stressed here tonight continuously is the need for a consensus on values. We are trying to make changes for the better, according to the pamphlet. "Look around you," says Bob Rae, "Your neighbour, different jobs, different backgrounds, different colour, different skin." So what do we share as Ontarians? That is the question. And the answer is values. Everybody has been talking about values, but nobody is addressing the question: Where do these values originate and how are they passed on?

I wonder if you people at the table would humour me and do something with me. Move your chairs back, please. I am going to demonstrate something with you. I am going to teach you something. I am going to teach you to stand up and to sit down. Just do exactly what I do and nothing else, please. Up, and down.

I could have sat here and spent about 20 minutes explaining the mechanics of standing up and sitting down. It is that simple. What we learned here is that kids learn by example, right? It is that pure and it is that simple.

What are the examples we are getting? We are getting, from television especially, that we are to go in there and kick ass. Ted Koppel had a father and a daughter on television last night. The daughter had signed up for the volunteer army. She had gone AWOL when her unit was called

in. He brought them both together because they had not talked to one another since October.

2040

The daughter made her point clear to the audience. Ted Koppel asked the father, "What do you want your daughter to do?" He said, "I want my daughter to go in there and kill the bastards." These are attitudes we have and that are being presented and being passed on from generation to generation.

We are now being prepared for nuclear war. It is being talked about as if nuclear war is acceptable. Better to nuke 25,000 of them than that we have 10,000 of ours killed in the sands of Arabia.

What is it we learn here in Canada? In Canada, is it materialism? Think of Christmas. What is Christmas all about? The good news? No, it is not. It is gift giving. It is the biggest time of the year that the merchants make the biggest buck. That is what Christmas is and has become. It is no longer what it was meant to be; it has become something totally different.

How can we combat racism? We have heard here the talk about racism and so forth. Where does racism come from? My own personal perspective is that racism comes from the fact that I do not understand where you come from. I do not understand what you eat. I do not understand what you believe. Therefore, you are different from myself and, therefore, you are less than myself.

To give you a very simple example, we are used to a pyramid of power. We have the boss man here at the top, and when he says jump we do not even get the chance to ask how high, we just jump. That is all there is to it.

My friend Paul Nadjiwon just spoke for the natives. It is interesting, because the way I taught you to stand up and sit down came from the instructor of a philosophy course in native philosophy. He says: "Our way of deciding things is around the table. We are like a spring. It wells up out of the ground and it feeds everybody that comes around it. There is no boss man." So here is one example of the difference of how people speak.

I do not have to tell you about the Oka incident. I only have to remind you of Ireland, where the Protestants are fighting the Roman Catholics. I only have to remind you of Palestine—Muslim and Judaism. I only have to remind you of India, where Muslim and Hindu are fighting. And now Saddam Hussein is calling for a jihad, and Mr Bush is answering, "We are the preservers of the good and we have to fight evil." So what do we have? Muslim and Christian killing one another off.

If you are serious about wanting to change the world, then start here in Ontario, as far as I am concerned, and implement religious studies in the school. Implement it. Right at the present moment we have on the books laws that say two times a week for 30 minutes each you shall give religious education in the classes, in each class. That law is being broken left, right and centre. Nobody, but nobody, is doing it.

What you accomplish by that is that I get to know where you come from. I get to understand what your values are and so forth.

There is a simple example they teach us here in Psych 101. The point is this. They put a screen here, they put a person there that I cannot see, and then they give me a box where I can crank up the electric juice; of course, that is connected to his finger. My instructor tells me, "Crank it up, crank it up, crank it up," and I cannot see anything, so I crank it up because I do not see what the consequences are. And this is the same as the bombers. What do you see? You see a video game, for Pete's sake. You see Mr Schwarzkopf making a great big joke out of the fact that here is this bomber taking out this bridge and look at that squirrel there scurrying away and watching the bridge being blown up behind him in his rear mirror.

As long as I do not see you, I do not care about you, but the minute I look you in the eye, the minute I know your name, that is when I get to know you. That is when we become friends and that is when I can no longer hurt you, or far less easily so.

I have to get to know his dress, I have to get to know his food, I have to get to know especially his religion. I am just about finished, Mr Chairman. These then are from their sacred scriptures, and it is not being taught in the homes. If it is not being taught in the homes, then where do we teach it? I suggest we teach it in the schools.

I would like to remind you about the great big debate about sex education in the schools. The scream was deafening: "There is no way that you're going to teach my children sex education in the schools. I'll do that at home." Well, you know and I know it was not being done in the home, so where is it being done now? In the schools. The same argument I would put forward here: It is not being done in the homes, put it in the schools, and not in a fashion that you indoctrinate people, but in an open and aboveboard fashion, to disseminate knowledge of other people.

The other day I visited for the first time a Unitarian church and on the door there is a great big slogan, "The best inheritance you can give your children are roots and wings." My suggestion is: No roots, no wings. As far as I am concerned, we are not providing our kids with roots.

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think you really have raised around the issue of values one that for a lot of us has been very troubling in terms of how we enable the religious experience, which is so much part of our lives for many of us, to be a regular part in some way of the school system. We keep wrestling with how you do it in a way that will not be offensive either between different groups of Christians or between Christians and Jews, Christians and Muslims or what have you.

Mr Vanderkam: Yes.

Mr Beer: I know in my own experience, going to a Quaker school, the things that I learned from that experience, which I did not feel were ones of force-feeding me or trying to make everybody in that particular school of one faith, were questions of values and ethics that were brought before us on a weekly and daily basis. I think there is a sense among many that we would like to be better able to have within our school system questions of values and ethics and religion. How do you see us being

able to do that in a way that will not be offensive and being able to do it in a way that is meaningful and not just a kind of muted television hype?

Mr Vanderkam: Sir, my suggestion to you would be that you go to Germany and investigate the system that they have over there. Several of the European countries have systems like these in place; the German system is one that I am aware of. There is one place to go.

For the rest, I am bothered by the fact that an awful lot of Christians are saying, "I want them to know this and nothing else." This is their right and I do not want to deny them that right, but that is being done in the home. What I teach them in the school is simply this: Christmas is this for the Christians. Surely, as a Hindu, you have no problem with that. You teach me, as a Christian, what Mohammed stands for. These are the festivities, these are the festival days and so forth. I, as a Christian, have no problem with that.

The only thing that would happen with me as a kid, hopefully, is that I go home and ask my parents, what is the difference? This is what ought to be happening, but it is not. Honestly, I look at the values that are loose in this country at the present moment and I shudder.

The Chair: Mr Vanderkam, thank you very much. One of our members, Ms Harrington, was reminding me that recently there have been new regulations announced by the Minister of Education which will facilitate school boards being able to have education about religion made available in our schools. That may be something that interests you.

Mr Vanderkam: Sir, I hope they can implement it. That is all I can say. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much for your comments.

Mr Vanderkam: Thank you for your attention.

2050

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF ITALIAN CANADIANS

The Chair: I call now Gina Rimanich, the president of the National Congress of Italian Canadians, Thunder Bay district.

Ms Rimanich: Unfortunately, due to the short time, I did not have a chance to consult with all my board of delegates, but the executive board and I put something together.

The National Congress of Italian Canadians is an umbrella organization, representing over one million Canadians of Italian background living across Canada. One of the major functions of the congress is to engage individuals, groups and associations in a dialogue and through a consultative process to arrive at the common solution dealing with a social, cultural, educational and economic aspirations and needs of people of Italian origin within the Canadian context.

It was founded in 1974 and the congress is made up of national executive committees whose headquarters are in the city of Ottawa. They are affiliated across the country, with districts and regions. All three levels of the congress are functionally autonomous, having their own individual

boards of directors, share the common objectives and set out the constitutions, namely:

To foster the evolution of a better Canadian society by promoting mutual understanding, goodwill and co-operation between Canadians of Italian and other origins;

To act as linkage among various Italian Canadian communities and organizations which are dispersed across the country;

To provide, when required, a means of two-way consultation between the Italian Canadian community and Canada and various governments and organizations;

To promote activities among Italian Canadians;

To provide a means for expanding local and regional activities within the context of the organization concerned on to the national scale, so many more people may benefit from it;

To promote and encourage the involvement of Italian Canadians in public affairs;

To foster the retention among Italians in Canada of their rich cultural heritage;

To interpret the attributes of their heritage to fellow Canadians and to promote encounters and interchanges with other Canadians cultural groups;

To represent, promote and defend the interests and welfare of Italian Canadians.

As I said, I did not have too much time to consult with everybody, but I am a Canadian, although I came to Canada in 1967 and I was already married with a child. I feel that Canada is my country and I am very proud to be of Italian origin and very proud to have brought another culture in this country. But I feel that Canada is a pluralistic society, a country that has given haven to people of European, Asiatic, African, Caribbean and South American ancestry.

It is also a country where people of Indian ancestry first lived. We must never forget this. It is a country whose people have varied cultural and historical backgrounds, varied religious customs and habits. It is a country that has evolved into its present multicultural position and the structures of old are no longer viable and workable.

All provinces should be equal. They are provinces of Canada, each in its own way harbouring a diversity of ethnic groups that constitute this country, where dreams have come true, where all people, regardless of colour, race and creed have been accepted and are making their living according to their industry and imagination.

Canada in the 1990s, 200 years after the Plains of Abraham, must offer a new order to its nearly 30 million inhabitants of diverse origin. It is a patchwork quilt of Italians, Hungarians, Polish, Portuguese, East Indians, Japanese, Chinese, Vietnamese and Jamaicans, and a host of other origins, living together in peace and harmony under provinces that are equal and a central government that is strong.

What I am suggesting here is, please, let's join hands together in trying to form a Constitution. Believe me, a Constitution is a mirror of our soul, and if we do not do that, we will never have peace in this country. Please, we want a Constitution that will stop labelling people. That is

the wish of the district of Thunder Bay National Congress of Italian Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Rimanich. I extend to you the same invitation that we extended to others, which is that if in the days to come your organization wishes to put together a more formal position to send to us, we would be happy to receive that.

Ms Rimanich: We will do so.

The Chair: I think there was at least one question. Mrs O'Neill?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes, thank you so much for coming.

Ms Rimanich: You are welcome.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I was very fortunate to have a member of your congress open my constituency office when I first became an MPP and I have a very soft spot for the work of your congress and the work you do with the young children throughout this province, particularly through the heritage language programs.

You seem to have some very, very solid values about what it means to have come to Ontario and certainly to have come to Ontario with a child and a family. I wonder if you could tell us some of the ways you have built bridges or that you think we could incorporate into our recommendations how we can encourage people to build bridges. You talked about Hungarians, you talked about Polish people and you talked about Canadians. Can you give us any practical example of bridge-building?

Ms Rimanich: I will. I came here, and the only language I spoke was Italian. Actually, my first language was Furlan, because I come from a province close to the Austrian border where two tribes of people settled. One people settled in Friuli and the other tribe settled in Switzerland. They are called the Grisons and the first tribe was the Furlans and still, to this day, that language is recognized, and that was my first language.

My second language was learned in school and was Italian. My third language was French. My fourth language was English. I arrived here with a large background of education. I studied Latin for many, many years and I found it challenging learning a new language and I learned the language fast. Of course, I have an accent, but it does not matter what I do, I cannot correct that.

My experience here: I arrived in a friendly country, but I also arrived in a country where I was labelled as a wop and I did not know what a wop was. Another name I was given was a dago. I did not know what a dago was. I asked for explanations and they told me, "Well, a wop means a flat tire and a dago means a dirty person." I figured I am not a flat tire and I am not a dirty person. Anyhow, my personal experience was that perhaps I had so much love within myself that I figured, "Well, maybe these people do not understand that I come from a very rich culture and perhaps I have something to give to them." I carried on with my studies; I learned my language.

What really hurt me was when my oldest son first went to school and at the time when he went to school he spoke Italian. So the first day of school he came back home and he said, "Mom, I don't want to be a wop any more." I said, "No, son, you are a Canadian." I remember that. So I think

that each and every one of us perhaps can embrace this country and love this country as much as I do, and if we have something to offer, please bring it to this country.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you so much for sharing your deep values with us.

Ms Rimanich: You are welcome.

2100

The Chair: We have come to the end of the list of speakers that we had before us. Before closing the proceedings, we do have a few minutes, not very much time. We are supposed to end at about 9 o'clock, but I just wanted to give the opportunity, if there are people in the public who have not had a chance to speak to us and would like a couple minutes of our time, we would be happy to do that. So I offer that invitation now, if there are people out there, on the understanding that we need to basically just give everyone a couple of minutes each if there are a few people. Could we just do that? Then we can go for another 5 or 10 minutes and then end at that point.

So if you would like to come up, sir. Yes, just come up to the microphones. Sir, would you like to just come up and then we will go one at a time. We need to have your names for the record.

JOHN GIBB

Mr Gibb: Thank you. My name is John Gibb. I am just quickly addressing question 2: How can we secure our future in the international economy?

I want to commend Premier Rae for his recent stand against the impending discussions involving free trade with Mexico. I, along with many other Canadians, believe that the present free trade agreement with the United States is bad for Canada. Let's remember that we as citizens of Ontario and Canada were not consulted. Our federal government did not have our consent to strike the deal with the US. Prime Minister Mulroney, along with President Bush, formed the agreement with full blessing of and under pressure from the most powerful multinational, or as we now call them, transnational corporations in the US.

Already we have heard of how many thousands of jobs have been lost due to the rationalization plans within US boardrooms. We were told by Mulroney and Crosbie and others that if we are against free trade, we are afraid to compete and not willing to take up the challenge of having access to the large US marketplace.

The question which was never answered was how the warehouses and branch plants of Ontario can compete with their parent companies in the United States. Listening to President Bush give his recent state of the union address, we heard him make it perfectly clear that the US goals of free trade have nothing to do with co-operation and are totally driven by greed and exploitation. President Bush said, in reference to the Mexico trade deal, he had no doubt that given a level playing field, US workers will outwork and outperform any competition. This signifies a win-lose proposition, with Canada on the losing side—just another step to the US realizing the manifest destiny.

I ask the committee to recommend that the government of Ontario make full use of our strength within the country

to do its utmost to help save it and keep Canada a viable nation.

Finally, I hope that Premier Rae will please continue to oppose Mr Mulroney's deliberate and continuous dismantling of this country. I would ask that Ontario play the leading role, which it must in fact play due to its size and strength, to assist the rest of the country in the following areas: for instance, support the CBC, our only real link and communication within this country for a free voice, an unbiased voice; support VIA Rail; oppose the present free trade deal with the US, such as reviewing control of outside purchase of Canadian businesses in Ontario; fight the involvement of Canada in Mexico trade talks; oppose the present involvement of Canada in the Gulf; tell the Prime Minister that Ontario does not support his assisting a big bully beating a smaller bully to a pulp until he finally says uncle; set an example for the rest of the country in other such areas as we will see coming up in Ontario's incorporation of an environmental bill of rights and other very positive acts such as this.

Simply, Ontario, act now to save Canada. That is my request.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Gibb.

ROLF TORNBLOM

Mr Tornblom: My name is Rolf Tornblom. As you might have noticed, I left any notes I had aside so that I can be as brief as possible.

First of all, I would like to say that I would like to see Canada remain as it is, whole, with Quebec in, but I am afraid the way things are going, especially since the Allaire report—in the past I have had a lot of arguments because I have supported this stance, that we did owe Quebec something. Not really “owe them something,” but our respect for their culture, their language, etc. But it seems to me that the way things are going, especially after the Allaire report that has come out—and it is not policy for the Liberal Party yet in Quebec, but I do not doubt that it will be when it has a conference, because nobody is going to vote against it. They are going to say: “Hey, this is great. Go for it.”

Even though there is speculation that it is just a starting point for negotiations, I do not see that at all, that we should even start talking at that level. Either they should come back with something a lot more reasonable as a starting point—not a hard and fast situation like in Meech Lake, that they were not going to give an inch—or there should be no discussion at all.

Once their citizens realize what the cost will be, like paying back Canada for all the federal assets, the share of the national debt, a corridor for transportation right-of-way through to the Maritimes and the return of Rupert's Land—which really does not belong to Quebec; it just administers it—their citizens may have second thoughts. If they do not, then they would have to prove through a plebiscite that they support their leaders, and then if they say that, “We don't wish to remain in Canada,” then we must let them go.

Then it is up to the rest of us in Canada to get together, stop our petty, mean-spirited, selfish squabbling and get

together to really make this country work the way it is supposed to work; a good, caring society where the people come first and do away with all the political finagling that has been going on just for the sake of appeasing some people so they can get their votes, etc. I think everybody understands what I am trying to get at.

I do not want to take any more time. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

OWEN ENRIGHT

Mr Enright: Mr Chair, my name is Owen Enright. I am a student here at Lakehead University. I was just walking through the agora. I knew this was on. I have classes later on, but there are just a couple of points I would like to make.

First of all, I agree with the two speakers from the open forum here who just walked up, who preceded me here. The first speaker, whenever he said that most Canadians are not consulted in any type of way whenever a major program or whatever you want to call it, the agenda, is put forward, I agree with him 100%. I was for free trade. I can understand his being against free trade, but it was never really a big issue put forward as one specific issue in the federal election.

The gentleman who was just ahead of me, I agree with him. I am Canadian, proud to be, but I do not see why anybody, any other Canadian, should have special privileges. They are Canadians. I accept the way that gentleman feels.

I know there are abuses or whatever, but I wish people would take the time and interest to step up and say something like this, here in front of the open forum, but I wish the government would also take the time to bring up maybe a resolution from each of the different parties and bring it out in a referendum-type approach in the election. Then whenever that government is elected and the issues are there, they can start developing programs to implement the issues there or whatever. It will give everybody a chance to put his point of view on a ballot, especially major issues dealing with the Constitution, free trade or anything else that is going to upset the tradition in this country. It has been a great tradition for quite a while, but for the last year or whatever, all we have heard is about the discontent in this country and about people not being able to get along.

2110

Well, I have worked in Quebec. I am unilingual. I got along fine. I know French students from Quebec up here, they get along fine and they have been unilingual for most of their lives. But everybody has had a unique experience by movement from different parts of the country, and I for one just would like to see Canada together and not separate. But I cannot see giving any—what is the word I am looking for?—any concessions without being consulted on it. I cannot see why a bunch of people sitting around in small back rooms or whatever should be able to decide the future of this country without putting it in front of the people who are going to have to live with their decision. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. I think the time has come to an end. I want to thank all the people who are here and all the people who were with us earlier today. We heard throughout the course of the day from 33 individuals or groups and I think heard a number of useful suggestions to the committee on the issues that we will be meeting to discuss and make recommendations to the Legislature on.

It is quite clear in the day's events here today, as well as in the previous two days, that there is a great deal of interest in the issues that affect this country and the future of this country and Ontario's role in it and that those feelings are there in a very deep way. Aotwithstanding the fact that we have other serious problems economically with the recession and obviously that our minds are also on what is happening in the Gulf, there are still people who are willing and eager to come forward and share those views with us. I think that helps very much our process as a committee in trying to

come up with some recommendations that reflect the kind of thinking that exists across the province.

We heard certainly today, as we have been hearing all along, a number of concerns about the process and the time lines of the discussion, and I will say again that we are very conscious of that and of the need for the discussions to continue. And we, I think, are very clear as a committee on our wish to look for ways to ensure that the discussion continues beyond the filing of the interim report that we will do on 21 March.

So with that, I again want to thank you for being with us today. Our hearings continue from Sault Ste Marie tomorrow, and I invite you here, and those people who are following us across the province, to follow us on the parliamentary channel, which will continue to provide coverage of the proceedings. Thank you very much. Good evening. We are adjourned until tomorrow.

The committee adjourned at 2114.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 6 February 1991

Thunder Bay Centre of the Deaf	C-135
Midwifery Task Force of Ontario, Thunder Bay chapter	C-136
Jack Masters	C-139
Prue Morton	C-140
Northwestern Ontario Women's Decade Council	C-141
Bob Rosehart	C-144
Bob Rongits	C-146
Association francophone du Nord-Ouest de l'Ontario	C-148
Accueil francophone	C-149
Fred Pretulac	C-151
Ernie Epp	C-152
Ontario Native Women's Association	C-154
Mary Robinson	C-156
Thunder Bay and District Injured Workers Support Group	C-158
Yves Robitaille	C-159
André Cloutier	C-161
Ann Fisher	C-163
Multicultural Association of North West Ontario	C-163
Bud Garrett	C-165
Ken Kooper	C-166
Evening sitting	C-168
Thunder Bay Multicultural Association	C-168
Aime Bouchard	C-170
Margaret Wanlin	C-172
Lisa Bibeau	C-174
Karen Lee	C-175
Lakehead University Native Students' Association	C-176
Marvin McMenemy	C-177
Peter Vanderkam	C-179
National Congress of Italian Canadians	C-181
John Gibb	C-182
Rolf Tornblom	C-183
Owen Enright	C-183
Adjournment	C-184

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Beer, Charles (York North L)
 Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
 Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Clerk pro tem: Brown, Harold

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office



C-7 1991

C-7 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 7 February 1991



Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 7 février 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Thursday 7 February 1991

The committee met at 1325 in the Civic Centre, Sault Ste Marie.

JOE FRATESI

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. This is the select committee on Ontario in Confederation in the council chamber in Sault Ste Marie. We are pleased to be here in Sault Ste Marie. This is the fourth day of our hearings across the province, and we have before us another full day, afternoon and evening hearings, in which we will hear from the public suggestions to us about the issues facing us in Confederation and the opinions and views that people of Ontario feel that we should take into account.

I invite the mayor of Sault Ste Marie, Mayor Joe Fratesi, to address the committee.

Mr Fratesi: Thank you, Mr Chairman. It is certainly my pleasure as the mayor to welcome this committee to Sault Ste Marie. I congratulate you, Mr Chairman and the committee members, not only on your interest but your involvement in what no doubt is an important task. I trust that the facilities and accommodations in our Civic Centre are commodious. Our local member tells me it is odd looking at me "out there." It is equally as odd for me to be standing here looking at you, Mr Chairman, sitting in a venue that I am accustomed to being a part of.

Over the last week or so, I have been contacted by several out-of-town media wondering if I intended to make a presentation before you today. My answer to them was simple: my views and the views of my city council are well known with respect to some things that this committee will deal with. Repeating them in this forum would be of no benefit to anyone, and I am certain that some media might wish to again focus only on that part of any presentation that I would make. I therefore decided that I would make no presentation to your committee today.

However, as I thought about my decision, it became apparent to me that even that simple decision might be misunderstood or misrepresented as my feeling that you folks were not welcome in Sault Ste Marie or that I, as the city's mayor, did not think your work was important or relevant. I would like to be perfectly clear on both points, if I may.

The city has been around for a long time and boasts of its friendliness and hospitality. We are all a warm and loving people here in Sault Ste Marie. We always have been and we always will be. We in this city are probably the best example of the diverse makeup of this great country of ours, with people from every ethnic background who form part of the very fibre of this community, and we are proud of that fact.

Everyone in this city is concerned about national unity. We believe that Canada must be bound together with a strong and a real glue and not simply held together with a

weak thread or some imaginary adhesive. You can say what you want to about our neighbours to the south, but I as one Canadian got more than just a little bit envious when during the opening ceremonies of the recent Super Bowl football game, I saw proud Americans, all colours of skin, all ethnic backgrounds, all ages, all creeds, all walks of life, all states and regions, proudly waving their country's flag singing—no, I guess, boasting—their national anthem with emotion and with enthusiasm.

That is the kind of Canada I would long for. Canadians from all parts and all provinces, of all ethnic backgrounds and all walks of life, Canadians who wave our maple leaf and mean it when they talk about glowing hearts, true patriot love and standing on guard, people who will say proudly, "I'm a Canadian first and, indeed, foremost" and who then will probably talk about their cultural backgrounds and ancestry. There should be reason enough for all of us as Canadians to work together with open minds to find a solution to our constitutional problems while at the same time protecting our Canadian traditions and values.

There should be no preconditions, there should be no deadlines. There should only be a sincere desire to work together to find the magic. We are a nation. Our country still comes out on top, and our people enjoy equal rights and status and opportunities.

This is the task that lies ahead not just for those of us who lead but also for those of us as Canadians generally with a common sense that we will play a big part, just as big a part as anything else in the discussions which will follow.

Ontario, because of its size, because of its geography and because of its traditional involvement in the unity of this country does indeed have a key role to play in the important constitutional discussions in the months ahead. I would like to congratulate and thank Premier Rae on his initiative in these matters and especially for his recognition that the input of the people of this province is a necessary part of the process, as it indeed is the future of my province and my country as well as your province and your country that will be the subject of the discussions ahead. Your role as a committee is therefore most important at this time, as are the views of Ontarians. This process provides the opportunity for all points of view to be heard and considered, and I see that to be the format that has been adopted by this committee, with a small-l liberal process surrounding it.

On behalf of the people of Sault Ste Marie and its local government, I would like to pledge our co-operation and our assistance both to this committee and to the province in the task that lies ahead, and I would like to again ensure that your presence is felt in this community and that the people of this community get the opportunity to be heard but, most important, that you walk away from this community

knowing that it is the same community that it has always been and the same community that it will always be. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Mayor. I suppose I cannot resist saying that I perhaps would categorize this process as being somewhat new and perhaps democratic but I will accept the small-l liberal as being part of that as well. I also want to say the Chair here feels quite comfortable, but do not take that as anything other than the fact that the chair is itself comfortable.

Before proceeding to hear the speakers that we have this afternoon, I want to just introduce the members of the committee to the public here and to those who may be following us over the parliamentary network. This is an all-party committee, and from the New Democratic Party caucus we have Gary Malkowski; Gilles Bisson, who is also the vice-chair of the committee; Margaret Harrington; Marilyn Churley; Fred Wilson, and David Winninger. From the Liberal Party caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative Party caucus we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick. Also joining us this evening is the local MPP for Sault Ste Marie, Tony Martin.

Just by way of explaining the process, we have slotted or scheduled people at intervals of 15 minutes for individuals and up to half an hour for organizations. On behalf of the committee, I would request that people remain even below that time frame if possible in your presentation to us because then that will allow us some time for some questions from the members of the committee. That, in our view, is also a useful part, so if we have the time we would like to do that as well.

We have managed to be able to add to the list some people who were not on our original list and we will call on them as we go through the afternoon. Before inviting the first speaker, I would just again pick up on one of the comments that the mayor made, which is that the input of the people of the province is important to us, and it will be crucial in the kinds of recommendations and suggestions that go forward from this committee. But also we see that the input needs to continue and those discussions need to continue and that this in fact is from our perspective the beginning of that discussion process aimed at helping us come up with some initial positions that will form our interim report and then allowing some further discussions between the end of March and the end of the June, when we will have to then draw up our final report.

CALM

The Chair: I call the first speaker, Francis Guth.

Mr Guth: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity of making this presentation. My name is Francis Guth. I come here today as the president of an organization called CALM, and CALM stands for Citizens Addressing the Language Motion.

Not having had the opportunity to read the discussion paper of the Ontario government on this issue, I would like to simply share a vision of Canada that I would hope would receive some consideration, if not

adoption, by the Ontario government in any future negotiations on Confederation.

In thinking about this and the focus I would take, I concluded that I could not do better than to begin by quoting a resolution approved unanimously last February by the senate of Algoma University College, where I am proud to say I work. The motion reads as follows:

"Moved that the senate of Algoma University College acknowledges and values the historic contributions of the first nations, and of the English and French founding nations, to our country and the region. We also recognize and celebrate the bilingual and multicultural dimension of our country and region."

It seems to me that this brief motion sums up the essential elements that define and distinguish our country. Let me comment on them briefly in turn.

1. The first nations: For much too long, we have shunted aside this constituency of our country. They were the first inhabitants of this land. They have and retain aboriginal rights. Their contributions are often ignored, but the first European fur traders and then settlers could not have survived without them. Their contribution during the war of 1812 to retain our identity and sovereignty as a country is not yet widely understood or acknowledged.

We are rightly concerned today in this country with environmental degradation. It is clear to me that our western scientific, technological civilization, with its inherently dominative and exploitative approach to nature, can learn much from our primal peoples about an ecologically sound and harmonious relationship to nature.

Ecologically speaking, Canada and the world are at a critical juncture as far as our common future is concerned. We will survive only if we develop and implement a working, sustainable equilibrium. This, I believe, could be greatly facilitated by bringing native values into the mainstream of our thinking and thereby creating a new and higher synthesis of the primal with the European.

It should go without saying that any future constitutional negotiations must have, front and centre, a preparedness to deal seriously with land claims and issues of self-government for the peoples of our first nations.

2. The English and French founding nations: Whether we like it or not, and regardless of the subsequent settling of Canada by people of many other national and ethnic origins—and my father and mother were among those—there are certainly historical facts about our country that cannot be denied or changed. Our Constitution and our laws have taken these into account.

When the British colonial powers took over the colonies in America from the French colonial powers—and I would like to emphasize "colonial" here because it was a colonial war, not a civil war, between French Canadians and English Canadians. In any case, the British were left with a population of mainly French-speaking settlers of already several generations, with their own customs, religion, language and laws. Much to their credit, the British of those days were wise and tolerant and practical enough to allow this settled population to retain its culture, identity, religion, language and legal system.

These historical facts are the basis of much that is unique and distinctive in Canada, including its duality of language, its dual school systems and its duality of legal systems. Dual systems often cost more than single ones, but they also speak to fairness to an earlier, indigenous population and make for a richer, much more tolerant cultural mosaic, rather than the one-dimensional melting pot.

As a country, the fairer we treat our first nations and the now minority component of our two founding nations, the fairer and more tolerantly, I submit, we will treat the minorities of other nationalities that have come to this country subsequently. And, I submit, the converse will also be true. So it would not behoove other minorities to get on to the anti-French bandwagon.

3. The bilingual component: I have already touched on the historical basis of this component. I would just like to add a number of observations. Being able to speak several languages is something we should consider a privilege and a benefit, not a burden. I believe that the young people across this country were beginning to come to this realization. It is too bad that an extremist, nationalist government in Quebec and organizations like the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada and our local version, the Sault Ste Marie Association for the Preservation of English Language Rights, are intent on spoiling this potential benefit for our young people. For the sake of our youth, we should not let them get away with it.

The behind-the-scenes, extreme right wing, often American groups that are pushing the anti-bilingual bandwagon have a deeper hidden agenda—that of dismantling the much more costly social programs in this country. Again, it would behoove organizations like APEC and SAPELR, made up mostly of older people, to realize that they are inadvertently supporting groups whose hidden agendas are directly against their own best interests.

While on this topic of bilingualism, I would like to say something about this community's infamous English-only resolution. We deplore the scapegoating of our francophone minority by a totally useless resolution that served only to create divisiveness, not only in our community but in the country as a whole during a time of constitutional crisis. We would only hope that the new Ontario government, as it readies itself for a new round of constitutional negotiations, will not be seen to be abandoning its 500,000 francophones while tolerating, and even rewarding, the political demagoguery that gave Sault Ste Marie its language motion and its national black eye.

1340

4. The multicultural component: Some of us still believe that a vision of Canada must include the notion of a rich, diverse, multicultural mosaic rather than a one-dimensional melting pot. Canada should celebrate and support its multicultural heritage and Ontario should press for this in any negotiations for the future Canada.

We want to raise our voices against the clamour that is heard more and more today that Canada cannot afford to continue either bilingualism or multiculturalism. These, along with our tradition of tolerance, even if it is severely strained these days, and our more caring social networks

are what make us distinctive and the envy of most other nations.

We realize and concede that this vision of Canada is not new and that it is unfortunately no longer widely held. It might even be considered as an élitist and centralist viewpoint. Nevertheless, the only alternative that has emerged seems to be that of a separate Quebec and an English Canada in disarray, the easy prey to being swallowed up by the United States. This, in our view, is not an acceptable alternative.

So is all this not perhaps already too late after all? "Is Quebec not already gone?" some would say. And then will English Canada not necessarily abandon most of the distinguishing components I have mentioned above and begin the inevitable slide towards becoming the next state in the union? Alas, I think this is a real possibility. To try to avert it, I would urge the Ontario government to do everything—short of a decentralization that would dismantle the country anyway—to keep Quebec in a future Canada that also includes the abovementioned components.

Ontario must play a leading balancing role, as it has in the past, in the tough negotiations ahead with all the other provinces and Ottawa. It must insist that Canada not be dismantled by piecemeal, bilateral bargaining between Ottawa and Quebec. Quebec must be made to realize what the true costs of separation would be. But the rest of Canada must also wake up to the real cost to itself of Quebec leaving.

We are decidedly not on the side of the clamour that cries, "Let Quebec go, and good riddance for the rest of Canada." We think that would instead be the end of Canada, and that would be a tragedy for us, our children and the world. Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Guth. There are a couple of questions. Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation. I know that I have had the pleasure of meeting with a number of the members of CALM and know very much how you have tried to bridge francophone, anglophone, and indeed all of the individuals and groups that make up your community.

I wondered if you might comment a bit on how you see relationships in Sault Ste Marie a year later, what kind of work has been going on between anglophones and francophones, as well as the other issues that you raise. I know some of us had the pleasure of having lunch with a number of members of the francophone community today, and I sense that people are very intent and serious on coming together. I think it would be useful to hear from you what your thoughts are.

Mr Guth: That is a difficult question to answer shortly and briefly. I think to some extent there is very much the situation of the two solitudes, partly because the dominant group—perhaps it is the dominant group; I am hoping it is not dominant any more—has refused to engage in any kind of serious discussion on the issue and instead uses mainly stonewalling and sticking-your-head-in-the-sand—or I guess in the snow here—tactics, ignoring the real harms and the real divisiveness that has been

caused in this community, and not only ignoring but denying against all the evidence. It seems to me, unless that changes, the community cannot come together the way it ought to and the way it has to in these economic times.

Mr Harnick: We, in some of the evidence that we have heard, have heard a recurring theme, and that is a desire that people have for each province to be treated equally. Do you believe that Quebec can be recognized as a distinct society and, at the same time, the other provinces be seen or felt as having achieved that equality?

Mr Guth: I guess the problem is how much you put into the meaning of "distinct society." I mean, the very fact that Quebec has a distinct culture, language, religion and legal system makes it distinct. I do not have any problem with that. I guess the problem people had with Meech Lake—and I had some problems with Meech Lake, by the way—was what you put, how much more you put into that definition of "distinct society" and what powers come along with that distinction. I think that is the issue, not simply the terminology "distinct society." Let's face it: Quebec is a distinct society; it is distinct from English-speaking Canada in the ways that I have mentioned.

Mr Harnick: Basically that is the fact.

Mr Guth: That is right.

Mr Harnick: Okay.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I want to thank you for your comments on how you see this nation and maybe where we have to go. I think you really hit the nail on the head to a certain extent in that I see you as a fervent nationalist, from the way you are presenting your argument, and I guess what is key here is that recognizing that Quebec is distinct and realizing what you are saying, your position is that we need to somehow not allow the stripping away of our federal powers because that somehow takes away, in your opinion, from what this is as a nation. What is the balance, in your eye? What needs to be done in order to meet some of the aspirations of Quebec in recognizing its distinctness, but at the same hand not diminishing the whole of the country. What insight can you give on that?

Mr Guth: I guess if I had some real new insights, I would be the Prime Minister's executive assistant or something, rather than a mere professor of philosophy. I do not know. In some ways I fear that the whole issue is already too late in the sense that it seems Quebec is intent on separation or at least sovereignty, and even the Liberal government in Quebec which is supposed to represent the sort of last stand of the federalists in Quebec has come out with a program that seems to be very destructive of the central government.

It seems to me that we have to face the facts about what is happening in Quebec and I guess our best bet is to for the rest of the country to quickly negotiate with Quebec and with the Liberal government, I guess, because that is probably now, after Meech Lake, the most modest starting point for negotiations that you are going to find from Quebec. You are not going to find even that brief a list, so to speak, of federal powers left if the Parti québécois has something to say about it.

I think we have to enter into very serious, tough negotiations with the understanding that this is their opening salvo and that they are going to have to back off from some of those claims. Hopefully, we can salvage enough of central powers for the central government to make it still a viable country, but exactly where the sawoff is I really do not know.

Mr Bisson: Just a very quick comment—

The Chair: No, I am sorry; I have to try to keep to the time lines.

TED HALLIN

The Chair: I call next Ted Hallin.

Mr Hallin: I think I should start with a little bit of background on myself. I was raised in Thunder Bay of one immigrant parent and another parent who—both parents spoke Swedish when they were first born. Their operative language became English and I believe even with the census-taking, although they were still fluent in Swedish, they would mark that they were anglophone.

I was first exposed to French in grade 9 in the Thunder Bay system and I was pleased and honoured to be part of a country that had this bilingual tradition. I embraced it, possibly more than you can imagine. I married a woman from Quebec. My first two children are bilingual in French and English. My stepchildren now come from a francophone ancestry, part of the aboriginal native French-speaking people who were here when Britain took over the colony and it became the British colony of Quebec, which incidentally stretched as far as Thunder Bay, as far as I understand, including the Ohio Valley, where Detroit is now and so on.

1350

My children then have part of both of the founding cultures within their ancestry, part of the franco culture and part of an anglo culture of immigrants. Immigrants came here in great numbers, first from the British colonies to the south and brought in the English culture en masse, so I believe that the basis of the anglophone masses here could be termed immigrants also.

We have forgotten about the first nations people here and I think it is very important that we recognize that they should be a part of our government. They are part of treaties that our government has. There has been, in our community, as you are aware, a recent backlash against francophones here. I submit that it has gone on for more than 100 years in that perhaps the majority of the people in this city come from a franco ancestry somewhere and have gradually become submerged in the anglo dominance here. Their ancestry is not reflected in the nature of their names. They have names that sound like they have come from another culture. They are unable to speak the French language. And the case in point, my stepchildren and my wife are unable to speak the French language.

Speaking of constitutional amendments, aside from that, I think it is important that we recognize that there has been a gradual devolution of awareness and a gradual evolving of the demand for more and more democracy in this country. I do not think we have had more democracy

than we have had now, but people are demanding that the structure be changed so that they have more input. We have a federal government that was elected with about 43% of the popular vote in this country and has about 70% of the seats, and people are feeling that they are not being fairly represented by this type of system.

I would propose a departure from the solutions that have been suggested so far in that we combine our federal electoral system so that some of the seats—in fact half of the seats would be allocated with respect to the proportional vote that a party gets in an election. Now where you have several thousands of people who are disfranchised in this country in that they voted for a particular party and do not have any representation at all.

If there were some mechanism where there could be percentage representation in the federal government by an amendment to the Constitution, I think it would give a little more satisfaction to people in their feeling of being properly represented. It would also create a situation where we would probably have minority governments for a long time, and minority governments, as you all probably realize, call for compromise, call for listening to the other side, call for a search for understanding.

I would suggest that the Ontario government is in a unique position right now to institute such a change, being elected with approximately the same percentage that the federal government was elected with. This provincial government was elected, I understand, with about 42% popular support, and again has about 70% of the seats in the Ontario Legislature. I would propose that if half of the ridings were merged with the other half of the ridings, so that instead of having 195 ridings in Ontario you would have approximately 100 ridings, the other 100 seats then would be made up by whatever system the political parties would decide within themselves as to who would represent them to make up the popular support percentage they would be allowed in the provincial legislature.

There might be some problems with the federal government in achieving such a system within Ontario, but it would start the ball rolling and it would get people thinking in this direction, that we need a better system of representation.

Another area that I hear discussion on is the Senate and we are told that the US system has a better system of representation because they have an elected Senate. Those same people who propose that seem to ignore that the US has about 10 times the population of Canada and has 100 senators. Canada now has 104 plus eight.

With the proposal for the Senate, if a person is suggesting reform to a system similar to the United States, then he should in the same breath be suggesting that with one tenth the population we have 10 senators to reflect the 100 senators that they have in the United States. I do not hear these proposals.

Our Constitution now currently has a provision that, I understand, with the next reform of the senatorial representation there will be 144 senators in Canada, depending on the census figures for Canada. It boggles my mind that we are going to have hundreds and hundreds of senators in this country and maybe a thousand members of Parliament

if these continuing constitutional provisions are followed through with. There has to be some amendment.

There is also a proposal for the amending process. The amending process is 50% of the provinces representing 75% of the population or vice versa; I forget exactly how it goes. The US system is that once a constitutional amendment is passed by the federal houses, it requires ratification merely by two thirds of the state legislatures. As to the system we had with the Meech Lake accord, we all know it had so many difficulties that I am pleased to see this type of reform starting to begin.

There is also a suggestion that instead of having 10 provinces, possibly to include all of Canada within the governmental structure the governmental arrangement be renegotiated to have, perhaps, five regions: a northern region, a western region, an Ontario region, a Quebec region and an Atlantic region.

Within education within the province, I think it is important that the province move forward with a better history education system, with the problems that we have had in misunderstanding in this country. I have seen it from a personal perspective. With my learning a second language I have come to realize that even with the media, the news that we listen to is different in French. It is not just translation. It is that the ideas are different, the concepts are different than they are in English.

One basic misunderstanding is the idea of our nation as a whole. In French it is a federation; in English we call it a nation. In French a nation is one of the national peoples who originated this country, such as the francophone nation or the anglophone nation or the autochtone nation, the aboriginal nation.

1400

In Ontario we have a Legislative Assembly. In Quebec we have a National Assembly. What is a nation? It is not clearly understood in anglophone Canada even yet that the Speaker in the National Assembly is le Président. It is these basic things which are misunderstood and it is very difficult for people to come together and to learn and understand.

There is a whole history of animosity and a lot of it has been brought over from Europe and from other countries in the world where killing has gone on and killing is going on today under the name of our nation. That is a tremendous and dramatic departure from the recent history of Canada, of being a peacemaker and people coming to Canada for sanctuary where they would not be terrorized by a government, where they would not be afraid for their life and limb from an action of the government.

A lot of people look to the American system. The American system has had a history of invasion and hegemony, occupying other countries, financing counterinsurgencies, financing terrorist groups. I do not know if everybody wants to emulate a government system that is tending in that direction. They also have a system of referendums, and with any type of political system, the majority of people are influenced by advertisements, and where do the advertisements come from? They come from the people with money.

The Chair: Mr. Hallin, perhaps you could sum up. You are getting to the end of the time.

Mr. Hallin: What I wanted to end up with is that we have hostility in this community and there is some hostility in other parts of this country, and we have to come together to resolve it, even if, as some people say, Quebec is not a part of this country. We still have to live with the fact that there are many francophones in Ontario. There always have been as long as Europeans have been here. There are many francophones in every other part of this country, and we have to recognize that. If Quebec separates as a separate country and becomes a unilingual nation, I do not know what—even in English we cannot distinguish between the nation of Quebec today and a nation of Quebec in the future because our language is so deficient.

I would like to add that we have a culture of our own. We have great artists like Stompin' Tom. We have people in this country who can generate a feeling of togetherness, but we have to put forward a greater effort to be a part of that.

I would like to conclude with a revised portion of a song by Georges D'Or: "If you but knew how my heart aches in Sault Ste Marie, you would write to me much more than you do. In Sault Ste Marie, Ontario, you would tell of the joys of Montreal, Vancouver and Winnipeg and of St Johns and of the north. I want to hear from all your parts, my dear land, Canada."

«Si tu savais notre angoisse à Sault Sainte-Marie, tu m'écrirais bien plus souvent à ma Sault Sainte-Marie». Merci.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hallin. I would call next Andy Lavoie from the United Steelworkers of America. He may not be here yet because we are a little bit ahead.

LILA LEACH

The Chair: I will ask then Lila Leach.

Ms Leach: Thank you very much. I got this thing together very quickly this morning, because I read yesterday's Toronto Star and it really worried me. It frightened me. It begins by telling us that Prime Minister Brian Mulroney will promise Canadians next week that the federal government will not stand idly by as a national unity battle rages but will produce its own plan before the end of the year for restructuring the country. Please folks, let's pull together. You know what he can do to us.

Canadians need leadership. They need leadership they can all depend on and respect. Politicians have to be accountable for their actions. Therefore, this forum should have been reversed. Politicians, at least those who have the courage of their convictions, should answer some questions as well. We have a right to know why we are subjected to segregation, why we cannot be just Canadian. How our money is spent—perhaps a bit of cost accounting would go a long way.

Our greatest problem is racial discrimination. We can never hope to achieve nationhood so long as we are forced to recognize the two founding races as top dogs, ignore the first nations, and relegate the rest into a conglomeration of multicults, each tribe encouraged to cling tenaciously to its past, remain in the ghetto, avoid integration. In order to

achieve these clearcut divisions you have to outlaw mixed marriages. We will never understand each other if we refuse to speak a common language. You cannot legislate, demand or buy respect.

This preoccupation with power, the struggle for special status, has made us the laughingstock of the world. We are not stable emotionally or economically. Even Canadians no longer invest in Canada. Would you invest in a company so consumed by a petty power struggle that it was going under?

Perhaps it is time for a bit of tough love. There is a song that goes: "God bless little children while they're still too young to hate." In Canada, you have to get them very young, because by the time they are pushed through our high-priced segregation system they know how to hate.

Even a program on channel 8, sponsored by TVOntario, featured a robot asking children to identify themselves by nationality. They were born in Canada, so they were Canadian. But they were told: "Yes, but your mother and your father were born in Italy, so you are Italian-Canadian," or German-Canadian or whatever. Why the hyphenation?

Thank you very much.

Mr Bisson: I understand some of the things. The only thing I have as a comment is that you made a comment at the beginning that one of the problems we have in this country is that because we do not all speak a common language we do not understand each other. I feel, being a bilingual citizen of this country, that I am better able to understand your viewpoint because I understand something of your culture. I beg to differ with you on that point. That is all.

Ms Leach: Well, you are special. We do not all understand each other, I am afraid.

Mr Bisson: But what I am purporting is that by understanding each other's views and walking a mile in the other person's shoes, maybe then we can better understand and maybe from there we can build.

Ms Leach: But must we all be bilingual?

Mr Bisson: We are not going to get into the debate. What I am saying is that we understand each other by walking in each other's shoes every now and then and exchanging ideas. Sitting there and saying if we all speak just the one language we will be better be able to understand each other—I just say I do not agree. I feel that understanding two languages or three or four opens a lot more.

1410

Ms Leach: It certainly does, but we also have to remember that ethnic people—I am one of them; I was born in Canada but I am still regarded a multicult—are encouraged to cling to their own language. If they cling to their own language, they cannot understand you and they cannot understand me. We have to look at everybody, not just the English and French.

Mr Bisson: I agree.

The Chair: That is really what I think Mr Bisson was also addressing, because again, as somebody who could

add a third element to that—I guess I would categorize myself as one of the multicults, to use your term. We certainly are in a situation where retaining the traditions and aspects and roots of one's culture and language does not necessarily have to impinge on the sense of Canadianism that can be within each of us.

Ms Leach: That is right, absolutely.

The Chair: Okay, good. Thank you.

BOB PALANUK

The Chair: I call next Bob Palanuk.

Mr Palanuk: I do not have a properly prepared speech as such to address to you today. I just have a few points. I am not accustomed to speaking in front of people, but because of the situation we have today I thought I would like to make a few comments.

I would like to ask a question of the committee. How many of the committee here are from north of Parry Sound? One.

The Chair: I guess there are two. There are two, with Mr Bisson.

Mr Palanuk: You are from Parry Sound?

Mr Bisson: I am from Timmins.

Mr Palanuk: Okay, two. How many here are of native descent? One. French? Or aboriginal?

Mr Bisson: Aboriginal and French.

Mr Palanuk: Aboriginal and French. Okay, one.

Politicians recently, especially in the last year to two years, address everyone as francophone and anglophone. I am third-generation Ukrainian descent. I am a Canadian, Canadian first. I speak Ukrainian. I eat Ukrainian food. So that is maintained. But let's not divide ourselves. We are all Canadians.

The next thing I would like to mention is Canadian symbolism. We have the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, we have some beautiful ships, we have Petrocan, and we have Air Canada. What does our federal government do? Keep in mind that everybody who comes here knows this is a Christian country. We do not say you cannot practise your own religion. You can practise your own religion, but do not change our symbolism. Turbans on the RCMP. This is what unites us—the flag, things like this. That big ship we were supposed to build to break ice up in the polar region got cancelled. We are going to privatize Petro-Canada. Without natural resources, what is our destiny?

Everybody hated Pierre Trudeau. He was arrogant, yes, but he was leading us in the right direction.

Air Canada has been privatized and it has gone down the drain. It used to be the show air industry to the world. What is it now? Like another American economy run?

Religion in our schools and all public places: that is ours. We are a Christian society. You come here, you become a Canadian. Do not try and change us from Canadian to whatever. My people came here, they became Canadians. They talk Canadian, they dress Canadian, yet the culture is very different.

A suggestion: make it illegal, federally and provincially, that a political party can put forth as part of its agenda separation or derogatory policy to destroy Canada as we know it today. Who goes to sleep with a fuse-burning stick of dynamite? Would you like to go to bed like that? That is what you do when you let parties like this come from Quebec and say, "Okay, we're going to just attach a tugboat and pull Quebec away from Canada." That is not realistic. If you want to have a strong country, you do not leave it weak in certain areas; you make it strong.

I suggest also that investigation be made at Laval university and McGill University and our old, rich politicians in Quebec, serious investigation. If you go back in history, you will see that these families have been pro-separation right down to the 1920s, and they are carrying on there right now. Their names are the top names in politics in Quebec.

I have done business with Russia, Germany, Romania, France, Britain, Scotland, Finland, Sweden; you name the country, I have done business with it. Business is done in English. The industrial language for business is English. Everyone here knows that. I know it; I have done it. Even the captains on the Russian ships teleaxed me in English to tell me that my product was coming across the Atlantic during the Cuban crisis. That is the language of the industrial free world. It should stop that Quebec penalizes English-speaking persons. That should stop immediately.

I would like to thank you for the short time you allowed me to address you. That is all I have to say.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Palanuk. I guess I would be remiss if I did not point out that while you certainly have the right to believe this is a Christian society, we also need to keep remembering that there are many people in this country and in this province who are of other faiths, and I think that their beliefs are really quite valid.

Mr Palanuk: I pointed that out, that everyone is allowed to practise their own religion, but we are a Christian society. People know that before they come here.

The Chair: I guess some people would disagree with that.

Mr Palanuk: If you want to maintain your own religion, maintain your own religion, go ahead.

The Chair: All right. Thank you, sir.

JOHN WEGLO

The Chair: I call John Weglo.

Mr Weglo: Mr Chairman, committee members, ladies and gentlemen and fellow Canadians, I am a Canadian who believes in a strong federal government. I believe in the family of Canadian provinces from sea to sea. You should note that I call myself a Canadian, not a Newfoundlander, Albertan or Quebecker. I just happen to live in Ontario.

The strength of our Canadian federation has always been based upon the stronger, well-to-do provinces sharing with the less-fortunate provinces; sharing, not "What's in it for me?" but sharing. That is why I do not object to the federal equalization payments, the regional and industrial

development grants or the farm subsidy programs which result in net federal costs for the provinces of Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia, with Ontario contributing nearly \$7.7 billion, or \$824 per person, with its 36% of the Canadian population, and Alberta contributing nearly \$4 billion, or \$1,700 per person, with its 9% of the population.

1420

On the other side, we have provinces which receive net federal benefits. These include \$2 billion to Quebec, or \$301 per person for its 26% of the population. The other provinces all receive close to or more than Quebec, from \$1.9 billion to \$3.4 billion, despite having much smaller populations, resulting in net benefits ranging from \$2,000 per person to \$3,900 per person.

Let us not get caught up in the rhetoric that Quebec got half of the \$5.5-billion equalization payments—it has 60% of the provinces qualifying for equalization; or that Quebec got 38%, or \$347 million, of the regional development and industrial grants with only 26% of the Canadian population, because Ontario got 22.5%, or \$208 million; or that 85% of the \$1 billion in special payments to grain farmers went to the west. Although people can use these numbers to promote any cause they like, it all comes down to sharing in order to strengthen the federation we call Canada.

My main concern is that we now have a member of our family who, like a teenager, wants more independence to grow and develop, to control its own destiny, which may result in the destruction of our family. I both admire and fear Premier Robert Bourassa. He is the most complete and shrewd political personage in Canada and has an all-consuming fanaticism for power. He has been completely machiavellian in his manipulation of the issues, the federal government, Brian Mulroney, the press, the opposition, the Parti québécois and the people of Quebec. He has created broad support for his position within the province by outmanoeuvring the Parti québécois and courting the population with inflammatory statements like, "A rejection of Meech is a rejection of Quebec," and that any opposition to Quebec is really due to intolerance or bigotry.

The fact is that I am angry. I am angry at the politicians and all three political parties for putting their own personal or party interests before that of our country. During the Meech Lake crisis, not one federal party was standing up for Canada. Instead they were playing petty politics, trying to catch the New Democratic Party in a compromise position so they could win a by-election in Quebec.

Brian Mulroney did nothing to support the wishes of Canadian people and the federalist cause. Instead, he accepted Quebec's demands and tried to coerce and blackmail the rest of Canada into accepting its demands without question. Premier David Peterson did little to help to mediate the crisis, and instead caved in at the end and was prepared to give up some of his Ontario Senate seats to bring everyone on side. No one spoke out for Canada.

I am also disgusted with the news media, which for once could not forgo chasing sensationalism and radical viewpoints, all in the name of reporting, or maybe more realistically, the big dollar. True, there was some good informative reporting of events and issues, but the net effect has been a polarization of the Canadian population.

The problem is that, with all this grand posturing and inflationary rhetoric and biased viewpoints, the average citizen in Quebec or Ontario only heard what the politicians wanted us to hear or what the news reported, not what was in the other person's heart.

At the time, we had no idea what we were fostering. Quebec's view of Canada is one of intolerance and bigotry due to the multimedia reviews of a few English Canadians wiping their feet on the Quebec flag, and the concept of the rejection of Meech is a rejection of Quebec.

English Canada sees Quebec's Meech attitude as "take it or we will separate," not only as a recurring theme in constitutional talks but personally insulting and reeking of blackmail. The effect of this tit-for-tat verbal exchange is that the average citizen really believes that the French do not like the English and vice versa. The bottom line is that Canada is in real danger of breaking up due to the polarization of public views and the politicians and the news media, which are still adding fuel to the fire.

What does Quebec want? I truly believe that Quebec will do anything to preserve its language and its culture. I would propose that throughout Canada, but especially in Quebec, we are dealing with the "me" generation. What is in it for me? And I want it now.

The main concern for Quebec is the assimilation by the English in North America and, potentially even more devastating, its declining birthrate. Therefore, they not only want to control their language and culture but their society as a whole. To do so they want much more provincial power than the rest of Canada wants, and they need specific control over their own language and culture, ie, distinct society, immigration, constitutional veto to protect their distinctness as well as legal, Supreme Court and economic opting out concerns.

What was Canada expecting? The problem is, however, that the rest of Canada is still working on a bicultural and bilingual theme that was instigated by Pierre Trudeau and promoted by René Lévesque's separatist movement in 1985. We would become a bilingual nation, a nation of two solitudes, yet still one.

Can a bilingual, bicultural nation really work? Perhaps if we had more time as our children go through French education in the schools and then their children, but under the pressure cooker of Meech Lake and the present constitutional ultimatum, it looks like too much, too soon. In any case, it looks like the rules have changed because while Quebec currently provides English services, it does not officially recognize or promote English services and in fact is much more likely to restrict English use in the future.

Ontario, with Bill 8 and the possible expansion of Bill 8, is now in a difficult situation, with the French groups not only wanting their education and culture protected in the province but also wanting it paid for. Some of it has gone as far as not wanting educational interaction with French immersion students of English background for the fear of contamination of the language and culture.

Bob Rae, as Leader of the Opposition during the passing of Bill 8, urged the Premier to take the next step beyond today's step which would include and recognize French as an official language for Ontario's 4.6% French

population and guarantee those rights in the Constitution. So again I ask the question: Can a bilingual, bicultural nation work? To be fair to ourselves I think we really need to consider that question.

Culturally, Quebec is leaps and bounds ahead of Ontario and the other provinces in evaluating its role in Canada. If we do not speak up now, we will not be heard, and if you do not ask for something, you will not receive it. In other countries that have bilingual cultures, such as Belgium, Switzerland and South Africa, the findings generally indicate that the two cultures do not blend. Therefore, there is always conflict over the control of language at the workplace and especially in the schools. The solution to date tends to be one of autocratically establishing areas or provinces for competing languages or cultures yet keeping them linked economically.

Therefore, it would be my strong recommendation that we do not guarantee official French-language recognition or services within the province of Ontario. Instead adopt the policy of unofficial services similar to that of Quebec and a continued development of our children with French education until we know where Canada is going.

How should Ontario deal with the Constitution and Quebec's constitutional ultimatum? First, it should be made clear that Ontario will not be pushed into any constitutional change by arbitrary deadlines. I think that the citizens of Ontario would expect our government, yourselves, not to rush into any changes and to keep coming back to the population.

1430

Second, Ontario should be presenting a strong federalist voice coupled with a hard-line negotiating position. Bourassa's recent constitutional ultimatum is nothing short of the dismantling of the federal government with Quebec getting sovereignty-association with a continued flow of federal funds from the other provinces and no debt load. He really insults our intelligence by pretending that this would be just a revised form of Canadian federation.

Just as Quebec has shown that it is serious by reviewing separation, Ontario must start to review how we would rebuild Canada without Quebec. Again, to be fair to ourselves, we really need to consider that question, so we do not get caught flat-footed.

Given Bourassa's outlandish demands, Ontario also must come from such a strong negotiating position. Hopefully, that is what they are, negotiating positions and not inflexible demands. If they are inflexible demands, we have nothing to lose, as agreeing to them would essentially result in the breakup of Canada as we know it now anyway.

To the politicians and the media, I would hope that you start to heal this rift rather than adding fuel to the fire. It is time that the politicians used their mailing privileges to inform the population rather than just sending out junk mail. In the case of the media, it is time to do objective reporting and stop chasing the sensationalism of fringe groups. To that extent I would highly recommend the reading of a 26 April Ottawa Citizen special report called "The Meech Lake Crisis," presenting both sides of the view, and

similarly, a Sault Ste Marie Star and Le Droit newspaper, 10 March issue, on "Bilingualism on a Tightrope."

In conclusion, despite all this tough rhetoric, we should also extend an olive branch. All the Quebec people really want to know is that they are welcomed in Canada, not rejected, and that they can continue to control their language, education and immigration.

Perhaps there is still time to salvage our country, but it will require extraordinary leadership. Since we have no federal leadership, within this context I would say to Bob Rae that he has just accepted the most difficult job in Canada. Yet I think him capable of it and I wish him luck.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Weglo. There is time for one question if you wait.

Mr Winner: You spent a considerable amount of time earlier in your presentation, Mr Weglo, discussing equalization and subsidy payments. As you know, one of the components of the Meech Lake solution provided that the federal government would compensate provinces that opt out of shared costs. I wonder if you accept that solution and, if not, whether you have any alternatives to suggest.

Mr Weglo: I have read a lot on Meech Lake and I do not pretend to understand it all. I cannot really offer any advice on that situation.

Mr Winner: That is fair. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Weglo. I just say two things in concluding. If you would before you leave ensure—I am just looking over to our research people to see—that we have the references to the two newspaper articles that you referred, I think they would be useful for the committee members. Second, I just want to pick up on one of the points that you made about your wish that we continue to consult with the people of Ontario each step of the way. Certainly our intention is to ensure that that happens.

I gather that the next presenters may not yet be here. They were scheduled a little bit later, but I will check just in case. Ed Thomas and Brian Cleary, are they in the room? No.

ÉCOLES SÉPARÉES CATHOLIQUES DU DISTRICT DE SAULT-SAINTE-MARIE

M. le Président : Jacques Cayouette, de la section de langue française du Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques du district de Sault-Sainte-Marie.

M. Cayouette : En commençant, Monsieur le Président, je voudrais souhaiter une bienvenue chaleureuse à tous les membres du comité spécial. Bienvenue ici à Sault-Sainte-Marie.

Ma présentation se veut brève afin d'accentuer certains éléments qui me sont chers, certains éléments qui contribuent à définir ce pays, cette province, cette réalité qui est la nôtre.

Le Canada est à se questionner. Les liens qui forment cette Confédération sont à se définir davantage. Il est à noter que l'on ne doit pas entreprendre ces démarches dans le but de rechercher une redéfinition, mais plutôt celles-ci doivent être considérées comme une étape d'importance dans le processus de réflexion nécessaire à concrétiser les

principes de base qui nous unissent. Cette réflexion porte donc sur une détermination plus précise, plus vivante de la définition même du Canada et du peuple canadien. Cette réflexion doit nécessairement aussi prendre en considération les antécédents, puisque comme dans toute circonstance du genre, le futur est inévitablement composé du présent et du passé. Il s'agit ici de formuler à partir de tous ces ingrédients une vision pour le futur, une vision d'un Canada qui se veut fort, une vision du peuple canadien qui se veut fier.

Pour ce faire il est important que cette vision, cette direction soit établie à partir d'une fondation solide, renforcée de la pierre angulaire qui est déjà en place. Au-delà de cette certitude, le défi a relever avec confiance est de dialoguer ouvertement afin de trouver un équilibre en ce qu'il faut à tout prix conserver, ce qui peut ou doit être modifié et ce qui peut ou doit être mis à part.

Ce processus n'est pas étranger au gouvernement néo-démocrate de l'Ontario qui, l'automne dernier, a dû faire face à et a dû répondre de façon pondérée à une réalité politique, économique et sociale qui lui avait été présentée par la population ontarienne. Cet appui a sans doute servi de toile de fond à la rédaction du discours du trône du 20 novembre dernier, puisque les principes qui s'y retrouvent sont généralement rassurants, à savoir que, afin d'avancer, afin d'apporter n'importe quelle amélioration, il faut reconnaître la réalité telle qu'elle existe et que le point de départ est nécessairement tiré de cette réalité.

Bien que plusieurs extraits de ce document puissent très bien servir de ressources de base à la présente discussion, je n'en toucherai qu'à un seul paragraphe, paragraphe qui se doit d'être mentionné par entre ces murs, et je cite : «Par ailleurs, nous reconnaissons l'importance de la vaste population franco-ontarienne qui apporte une énorme contribution à la vie de la province et nous sommes déterminés à travailler en étroite collaboration avec la communauté francophone de l'Ontario afin de préserver ces droits.

Et c'est justement à ce sujet, au sujet de ces droits, de conserver ces droits acquis que, au nom des membres de la section de langue française du Conseil des écoles séparées catholiques du district de Sault-Sainte-Marie je voudrais élaborer. Je me dois de vous dire, et ceci très clairement et sans équivoque, que les francophones catholiques ont des droits, comme peuple fondateur, qui doivent être à la base de toute discussion constitutionnelle, que toute considération d'amendement à la Loi constitutionnelle de 1982 doit absolument enchaîner au strict minimum les principes fondamentaux que l'on retrouve dans la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés et plus particulièrement les droits religieux et les droits linguistiques. À ceux-ci viennent s'ajouter les droits sociaux et les droits économiques qui s'y rattachent.

Pour ce qui est de droits religieux, il faut comprendre et se rendre à l'évidence que ces droits acquis font partie intégrante de l'histoire de ce pays. Ceci a été reconnu par l'article 93(1) de la Loi constitutionnelle de 1867. Ceci a été reconfirmé avec confiance de cause en l'incluant dans la Charte et par d'autres lois depuis, la dernière étant la parachèvement visée par la Loi 30.

Reconnaître l'histoire du fait religieux au Canada, l'histoire de l'acquisition des droits religieux en ce pays est aussi reconnaître par le fait même le fondement du fait français au Canada, le parallèle de l'acquisition des droits linguistiques et, par conséquent, l'importance de ceux-ci tels qu'on les retrouve dans la Charte.

Ce lien qui existe entre les droits religieux et les droits linguistiques est l'essence même de la réalité et de la fierté franco-ontariennes. C'est pourquoi il est primordial non seulement de conserver, mais de valoriser l'éducation catholique de langue française. Le jugement Marchand et la Cour d'appel de 1984, la Loi 75 de 1986 et le jugement Mahé de 1990 sont tous des exemples de pas positifs de la volonté politique qui existe, qui ont comme but, espérons-le, de finalement commencer à répondre aux aspirations des francophones, ce qui n'équivaut vraiment qu'à leur accorder ce qui leur est dû et ceci depuis déjà trop longtemps.

Dans le domaine des droits sociaux, la première affirmation officielle de ces droits a vu le jour par le dépôt de la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français. Afin d'alléger certaines craintes exprimées de part et d'autre vis-à-vis soit son interprétation ou son application, il incombe au gouvernement de redoubler d'ardeur face à l'intempérie, fort de la conviction du bien-fondé de cette Loi, de la nécessité d'un certain rétablissement de justice sociale et de tout autre sentiment similaire qui a sans doute joué dans la formulation du texte et de son préambule, puisque c'est ce qui s'en dégage.

1440

Cette conviction est toutefois ombrée de façon sérieuse non pas par une réaction quelconque à ce qui était légiférée, mais plutôt par la possibilité d'interférence à la notion première qui apporterait l'entérinement en loi de certains propos qui ont été avancés dans le rapport du Comité d'étude provinciale-municipale sur les services sociaux, à cette possibilité que de préserver les droits acquis dans certains cas ne pourrait plus être garantie. En ce qui a trait aux débats entourant l'unité nationale, il est important de comprendre la position des Franco-Ontariens. Quoi qu'il advienne de la question constitutionnelle de la nouvelle entente qui se formule progressivement entre le Canada et le Québec — et ici, permettez-moi une parenthèse pour dire que je partage l'enthousiasme exprimé par M. Rémillard cette semaine suite à l'entente fédérale-provinciale qui a été conclue — quel que soit le dignement de ce chapitre dans l'histoire du Canada, il est important de reconnaître que les droits acquis doivent être protégés et dans un deuxième temps que les Franco-Ontariens soient reconnus à part entière pour ce que nous sommes. Nous ne sommes pas des exilés, nous sommes chez nous ici en Ontario pour y rester, ce qui veut dire que les termes tels que «francophones hors Québec» et «Ontariens», à part leur sens descriptif qui est aride, bien que techniquement correct, s'attaquent au cœur même de la francophonie en Ontario.

Pour ce qui est de revendication autochtone, il devrait être incontestable que toute entente formelle conclue avec les premières nations, soit avant ou après la Confédération, ait la force d'un article constitutionnel. Il est grand temps

de reconnaître les possibilités que renferme ce vaste et magnifique pays, ces possibilités que, semble-t-il, les autres nations du monde entrevoient plus clairement que nous ne l'avons collectivement fait à date, de reconnaître que nous sommes depuis toujours à ce seuil et que la clé à la portée de la main est le respect mutuel dans le plein sens des mots.

Je termine avec le préambule à la Charte, un énoncé court mais à point. Puisse-t-il guider vos délibérations.

«Attendu que le Canada est fondé sur les principes qui reconnaissent la suprématie de Dieu et la primauté du droit.» Merci.

M. Beer : Il y a une chose, peut-être, c'est plutôt un commentaire que j'aimerais faire parce que vous êtes la deuxième ou troisième personne à souligner le rapport provincial-municipal sur les services sociaux et j'aimerais souligner que mon prédécesseur comme ministre des services sociaux, M. Sweeney, et moi-même et, je pense, le nouveau gouvernement, tout le monde a dit clairement que, dans le cas où l'on transfère l'administration de certains services sociaux de la province aux municipalités, on va assurer que les francophones vont continuer de recevoir ces services dans les régions désignées en français. Je pense que s'il y a des inquiétudes là-dessus, il y a assez de commentaires faits dans la Chambre ou dans le Hansard des débats pour souligner qu'on va continuer de fournir des services en langue française.

M. Cayouette : Ce que vous dites est rassurant, mais vous comprendrez ces aspirations qu'ont les francophones à préserver ces droits acquis et je crois aussi qu'il est tout aussi important, si telle est la volonté politique lorsque ceci serait mis en place, de reconnaître ce principe fondamental et aussi de le reconnaître non dans un énoncé général, mais de façon à ce que l'application de cet énoncé ne pourrait être interprétée.

M. Beer : Je suis d'accord.

M. Cayouette : Merci, monsieur.

The Chair : I would like to go through the remainder of the list, realizing that we are a little ahead of schedule, but in case some of the other presenters are here. Are any of the people from the Indian Friendship Centre here? Carolyn Harrington, Claudette McLeod? No? Okay. Lisette Lapointe and Gail Broad? Are you Lisette Lapointe?

Ms Lapointe : Yes.

PORTE-OUVERTE

Mme Lapointe : Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, mesdames et messieurs, je désire tout d'abord remercier les membres du comité spécial sur la place que doit occuper l'Ontario dans la Confédération, d'avoir pris l'initiative de faire le tour de la province pour consulter les électrices et électeurs et de me fournir ainsi l'occasion d'exprimer mon opinion sur le rôle que doit jouer notre province au sein de la Confédération canadienne. Je considère ce sujet très important pour l'avenir de notre pays, le Canada. La Confédération d'un pays détermine les droits de ses citoyennes et citoyens et contient et érige toutes les lois les concernant. C'est pourquoi je suis heureuse de pouvoir exprimer mes attentes vis-à-vis du

mandat que lui incombe la défense de sa population sur une même égalité, peu important sa langue, sa culture et le reste.

En tant que Canadienne française d'origine québécoise, je suis heureuse d'avoir l'occasion de présenter mon point de vue sur la place que doit occuper l'Ontario dans la Confédération canadienne, même s'il me fut très difficile de prendre la décision de me rendre à Sault-Sainte-Marie pour les raisons que vous connaissez. Résidente de cette région depuis plus de 21 ans, j'ai participé aux développements économiques et sociaux de ma région et de ma province. Je veux ici confirmer que je vais continuer, étant coordonnatrice d'un centre d'alphabétisation pour adultes francophones. Je considère important que les francophones de cette province puissent exprimer leur opinion sur un sujet qui pour moi est d'une importance primordiale pour l'avenir du Canada.

La communauté francophone de la région de Wawa-Dubreuilville est dynamique, vibrante et déterminée à protéger sa langue, sa culture française. Le centre d'alphabétisation Porte-Ouverte est un acquis dans ce sens. Je sais que nous sommes dotés de quelques institutions francophones scolaires, telles que les écoles primaires Saint-Joseph et l'école secondaire Carrefour-Supérieur-Nord, qui n'est que dans sa sixième année d'existence, ainsi que le Centre francophone chez nous et le Cercle le rouet. Plusieurs agences de services sociaux visent à offrir leurs services en français tels que l'aide à l'enfance, le service d'aide sociale et l'Unité de la santé Algoma. Certaines de ces agences disent desservir la communauté, par contre, le personnel embauché pour ce faire a souvent bien de la difficulté à s'exprimer en français.

L'hôpital semble être intéressé à vouloir mettre sur pied un programme de services en français pour desservir la population francophone de la région que je représente. Laissez-moi vous dire que c'est un souhait général de la part de la communauté francophone.

Le Canada est à une étape délicate et déterminante face à son avenir. Depuis moins d'un an beaucoup d'événements peu attendus sont survenus dans ce pays qui se disait si paisible. Rappelons-nous l'échec du Lac Meech, qui a déçu une grande majorité de la population canadienne, la crise d'Oka, qui a suscité différentes opinions parmi les habitants de notre pays, la reprise des idées souverainistes au Québec dû au fait que ce peuple se sent rejeté du reste du pays, le sentiment d'aliénation de l'Ouest canadien, le traitement réservé aux autochtones, tout ces faits remettent en question l'existence même de notre pays, le Canada. Je crois que l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle supérieur dans les décisions prises sur l'unité des différentes régions du pays.

1450

L'Ontario est une province reconnue pour sa puissance économique et sa force d'attraction industrielle ; elle a donc moins de demandes fondamentales de changements à formuler et peut ainsi jouer un rôle de médiateur. Dans le rapprochement de différentes communautés, considérant la présence d'un demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes culturels et des communautés autochtones, je crois

que ceci justifie que l'Ontario est bien situé pour signaler l'importance de maintenir des liens étroits et productifs entre les différents éléments de sa communauté. Dans la définition de l'unité du pays, l'Ontario doit occuper une place importante et se doit de négocier avec le gouvernement fédéral des lois justes et équitables pour toutes les différentes provinces de notre pays, le Canada.

L'Ontario devrait tenir compte des diversités linguistiques et de l'économie locale et régionale qui les composent, de la culture de chaque peuple formant les différentes populations provinciales à travers le Canada. Je reconnais les quelques efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario a investis pour que les francophones de ma région se sentent partie prenante et participants au dynamisme de l'Ontario, soit l'obtention dans notre région d'une école secondaire française et le support du programme d'alphabétisation francophone.

Mais je crois qu'il reste beaucoup à faire en ce sens et en voici quelques exemples.

Je demande que ces efforts soient poursuivis et intensifiés en désignant notre région selon la Loi sur les services en français. Cette loi, présentement, ne s'applique qu'au gouvernement, car les agences de services sociaux, les services de santé et nos gouvernements municipaux demeurent libres de demander la désignation. On dit que les services en français coûtent cher au peuple canadien. Messieurs les députés et ministres, faites en sorte que ces services soient appliqués le plus tôt possible et le gouvernement économisera plusieurs millions.

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario par l'entremise de la direction de l'alphabétisation a démontré des économies substantielles de l'amélioration des communications et en milieu de travail. Nous sommes persuadés, à Porte-Ouverte, que la même logique s'applique à la fin ; une étude des services en français s'impose de ce fait. Faisant la promotion de la dualité linguistique dans la province, nous savons tous que cette dualité existe réellement dans notre pays. La culture et la mentalité des peuples ne sont pas les mêmes pour tous. Pour ce qui est de la culture française, chaque francophone de cette province doit s'occuper de la conserver et de la donner en héritage à ses enfants. Mais pour cela, nous avons besoin de l'aide de votre gouvernement. La communauté francophone est l'un des peuples fondateurs de ce pays qui, dès le début du 17^{ème} siècle, étaient présents par l'arrivée de Samuel de Champlain à Québec en 1608. Aujourd'hui, je suis fier d'être Canadienne, mais j'espère pouvoir un jour être fière d'être Franco-ontarienne.

Financer adéquatement les programmes d'éducation de base et les programmes d'alphabétisation populaires francophones de l'Ontario : on sait que le taux d'analphabétisme chez les Franco-Ontariens se situe entre 38% et 42%. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario est conscient du fait que les institutions francophones au niveau secondaire n'existent que depuis quelques années et qu'au niveau post-secondaire et universitaire, nous, Franco-Ontariens, ne jouissons pas d'un système enviable au Canada.

Comparés aux anglophones du Québec qui possèdent leurs écoles primaires et secondaires, leurs universités et la

gérance de leurs systèmes scolaires ainsi que leurs hôpitaux, nous, Franco-Ontariens, faisons piètre figure en comparaison avec eux. Si le taux d'analphabétisme est si élevé chez les francophones ontariens, la faute en revient directement au système de l'éducation de l'Ontario qui, par ses politiques d'assimilation, n'a pas su dans le passé répondre aux besoins d'éducation dans notre langue maternelle. Le rôle de l'Ontario dans ce cas-ci est de faire inscrire dans la constitution canadienne le droit à l'égalité d'éducation des francophones à partir du primaire jusqu'au niveau universitaire, en lui fournissant les institutions françaises et surtout la gérance de celles-ci.

Supportant les médias d'informations francophones, par exemple, les postes de télévision diffusant l'information locale et régionale, les journaux francophones de nos régions : les coupures actuelles à la Société Radio-Canada ne favorisent aucunement le développement de la minorité francophone. Par la fermeture de la station de télévision de Toronto, nous sommes privés de la seule source provinciale d'informations que nous avions en français dans notre région. Il nous sera très difficile dans l'avenir d'être bien informés. La seule source d'informations françaises que nous avons est la station de radio CBON de Sudbury. Il s'avère déjà difficile pour cette station de radio de couvrir tout le Nord de l'Ontario. Peut-on leur en demander davantage ?

En mettant sur pied des programmes français destinés aux femmes, comme les garderies, aide aux femmes battues et intégration du marché du travail, programme d'études secondaires et post-secondaires en français pour les adultes, ne serait-ce pas là la façon de démontrer au reste du pays votre intérêt envers votre minorité francophone ?

En répondant au document de consultation, je désire souligner les commentaires suivants vis-à-vis du Québec. Nous savons tous que le Québec a un caractère différent des autres provinces du pays. Le temps est maintenant venu pour l'Ontario de reconnaître ce fait, ce qui ne lui enlève en rien dans les droits qu'elle possède au sein du gouvernement du Canada. Le Québec est la seule province dont la population est en majorité francophone. On dit que le Québec désire la séparation du reste du Canada. Est-ce que la majorité anglophone ne s'est jamais attardée à se demander si elle n'était pas la cause de cette demande de séparation ?

Se sentant un peuple différent, les résidentes et résidents de cette province n'ont pas la certitude d'être chez eux à travers tout le Canada, et je crois que c'est la même impression pour bien des Franco-Ontariens. Quelle est la définition d'un Franco-Ontarien dans la constitution canadienne, et comment ces droits sont-ils définis, avec ou sans le Québec ; s'il vous plaît, donnez l'exemple au reste du pays. Inscrivez les droits des Franco-Ontariens dans la constitution.

Nous sommes conscients tous et chacun que nous vivons un moment critique de l'histoire du pays. Les Ontariens et Ontariennes, et davantage le gouvernement qui les représente, doivent jouer un rôle clé dans la définition du Canada. Je garde l'espoir qu'un Canada est encore possible avec la bonne volonté de tous les peuples

qui le forment et qui sont fiers d'être des Canadiens et Canadiennes de ce grand pays qu'est le nôtre. Merci.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: May I speak for a moment to you? I thank you very much for coming today. You speak with passion and a great deal of feeling and, I sense, hopefulness. I do not know what your connection with the educational system is, but you did mention it several times. I do not know whether you are a teacher, trustee, parent. Maybe you would like to tell us that. You seem to feel that you have made that transition to the French educational system or with the French section of your school board rather well. Could you tell us a little about why you think that bridge has been built with such a strong foundation, or some of the things that were important when that French school and its governance structures were established? I think it may help us to build bridges in other places if you could tell us why that has been a success.

Ms Lapointe: I do not understand your question because—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I thought you might have had a translation. Sorry.

1500

The Chair: Il doit y avoir un traducteur. Ms O'Neill, perhaps you could just summarize your question again so it could be translated.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You spoke often of education throughout your presentation. You did that with some sense of hopefulness. You seem to have had a successful experience over the last five years—I think you said six—that you had been working with the establishment of the French school in the Wawa area. I wonder if you can say a little about why you think that was a success. Maybe that would help us build some bridges if you could tell us some reason. You do speak with passion and hopefulness.

Mme Lapointe: Une réussite, je ne sais pas si c'est vraiment une réussite. Disons que pour les commissions scolaires et tout on demanderait la gérance au moins des conseils scolaires, de nos propres écoles et tout. Si je vais exprimer mes sentiments si profondément, c'est peut-être que mes enfants sont partis pour l'école secondaire, l'université et tout, et même j'ai un fils qui, pour prendre ses cours en français est obligé de se rendre à l'Université Laval à Québec parce que dans le système d'éducation en Ontario, il ne peut pas prendre son instruction en français.

M. Bisson: Premièrement, j'aimerais vous féliciter pour le courage d'être venue par l'avance. Vous avez exprimé un peu vos sentiments. Vous avez mentionné dans votre présentation un point que j'ai trouvé intéressant et je pense que c'est quelque chose qui est un peu central à la question. Vous avez dit dans votre présentation qu'une partie du problème, c'est que ni un bord ni l'autre vis-à-vis de la question francophone/anglophone comprend quand ça touche l'histoire de la question elle-même. Le francophone au Québec ressent ce qu'il ressent par expérience, c'est quelque chose qu'il a vécu pour toute sa vie ; c'est la même affaire avec les anglophones. Ma question est : comment essayer de faire comprendre au monde que chacun a son idée, sa question, chacun ressent ce qu'il

ressent pour une raison ? Mais ça ne veut pas dire qu'on ne peut pas s'entendre. C'est quoi le véhicule que l'on peut utiliser pour ça ?

Mme Lapointe: C'est sûr que si les deux peuples voudraient s'entendre, ils pourraient avoir possibilité d'entendre, mais je pense que les anglophones devraient au moins donner peut-être plus de droits aux francophones. Puis si on compare ce qu'il y a au Québec comme je disais tout à l'heure, ils ont leurs universités, ils ont tout, tandis qu'ici nous on n'a pas ces choses-là. C'est sûr et certain que le Québec dans le Canada devrait avoir un statut distinct auprès de la Confédération, pour conserver sa langue et sa culture, qu'il se mette une petite heure, et en minorité, et ça lui fera au moins des droits spécifiques pour pouvoir continuer à être un peuple autonome et conserver sa culture française.

M. Winninger: Nous avons écouté des gens qui veulent dire que là où la population franco-ontarienne est très, très minuscule, il ne faut pas offrir les mêmes services en français qu'en anglais. Avez-vous quelque chose à dire à ce sujet ?

Mme Lapointe: Bien, la population est peut-être minoritaire, c'est sûr, mais je ne pense pas que le gouvernement, vient le temps de remplir les formules d'impôts ou quoi que ce soit, diminue les impôts parce que les francophones n'ont pas leurs services. On paie le même nombre d'impôts sur notre travail et tout. Je pense que la communauté francophone contribue quand même beaucoup au développement économique de la province ici dans le Nord de l'Ontario aussi parce que les francophones sont en grande majorité dans le Nord de l'Ontario.

The Chair: I would just like to ask if any of the people I called out earlier are present in the room now. No? I will just go through again: Andy Lavoie, Ed Thomas, Brian Cleary, Carolyn Harrington, Claudette Chevrier-McLeod, Gayle Ouellette, Terry-Lynn Coulis, Gail Broad. What about Denise Martel? No? Okay. Those were scheduled for a little later, most of them were. I am going to suggest to the committee that we break for about 15 minutes and then resume when the other presenters will have arrived.

[Interruption]

The Chair: Thanks for bringing it to my attention. I apologize to the people here for not raising that earlier. I was going to announce that after the break. As you say, all of the simultaneous translation devices are being used now. For people who require translation either into English or French, I guess French is possible by following in the room next to us. There are a few others we have here that some of us do not need. We could make those available as well. That service is available, as you indicated.

Okay, we will break for 15 minutes.

The committee recessed at 1507.

1606

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order. We are resuming our hearings from the Civic Centre council chamber in Sault Ste Marie.

SAULT STE MARIE
INDIAN FRIENDSHIP CENTRE

The Chair: The next group I would like to invite to speak to us is from the Indian Friendship Centre. There are four individuals. I will ask them to introduce themselves before they begin.

Ms Chevrier-McLeod: I am Claudette Chevrier-McLeod, the criminal court worker for the Sault Ste Marie Indian Friendship Centre. With me is Carolyn Harrington, the community development worker. We have a student placement from the family court worker program; her name is Gayle Ouellette. Terry-Lynn Coulis is our referral worker.

I am going to do an introduction and then they will address some specific things that are of concern of our community.

The status of the first nations within Confederation as it stands is ensured with the federal government through treaties and the Constitution. There is no defined relationship between the provinces and the first nations for off-reserve natives. Urban natives are dependent on the whims of whichever government is in power at the time for representation and for services.

While the Ontario government has been implementing programs that address native needs since the 1960s, these programs have been of a Band-Aid nature in response to crisis situations. Some examples that come to mind are the high dropout rate of native students, the recidivism of native people in jail, inadequate housing, inadequate health care for natives, especially when it comes to our elders, and there are many more other areas. We need major surgery.

We need long-term commitment to native programming. There have been native components to programming in the ministries and what we consider tokenism, when a native person is put into a position just to—what is the word?—pacify our needs. The ministry needs to hire more native consultants. The moneys have not been available for native organizations to develop appropriate programs to service our membership.

The moneys allotted for salaries are much below what a comparable job in the government would be paid. With pay equity, we are asking: Where is our pay equity, if pay equity is supposed to be put into play? Were do the moneys come from, if you are requesting that people get pay equity? Some of the people in the friendship centre are being paid below any other agency that does a comparable job. We feel the time has come for the provincial government to take a stand and develop a mandate of its own pertaining to urban natives of this province.

Members of our staff would like to address some of the more pressing matters that are of concern to our community at this time, and then we will answer any questions the committee may have for us.

Ms C. Harrington: My role at the Indian Friendship Centre is community worker, and I also do much of the education work. I am speaking not only for the friendship centre at this time but also for a committee we have in Sault Ste Marie that involves membership from the bands and all the local urban native organizations. We work very

strongly together as an educational unit, and we direct our concerns to the Ministry of Education.

The province has stated a commitment and an interest in the preservation of native languages, yet within the ministry there is no personnel responsible for the native-as-a-second-language program. We need someone in the ministry to be responsible for curriculum development, for resource development and for classroom teacher development, and we would ask that the ministry place a native language consultant at the regional ministry office for the Ojibway language program.

A second concern is that the native language in the school remains only an option at the secondary school level, that native students who have taken Ojibway language through elementary school are still compelled to take French as a compulsory subject, unless they have the personal exemption of their principal from taking French. We ask that the ministry make Ojibway a compulsory subject in lieu of French for native students. We have been asking that for several years now. I remember we first asked Keith Lickers from the ministry in 1985. We ask yearly, and they say it has to be done at a political level, so we are asking you now. We would like you to start addressing it.

A third area is the native dropout rate. It has been acknowledged as shockingly high across the province, especially the north. Last year there was a principals' conference on this issue, but we have not seen anything come out of that. We were hoping that perhaps, as a starter, there would be native student counsellors placed in the schools for our native students.

Ms Ouellette: I am Gayle Ouellette. I am a student placement from Sault College at the Indian Friendship Centre. One of the concerns I have, just since I have been at the friendship centre since January, is the lack of a place to send our native youth. We had a teenager just recently; she did not fit into any of the guidelines that Cara House or the Women in Crises Centre have, so we had no place to send her. Fortunately, one of our native elders took her in overnight.

Also, this city could use an open-custody facility for the natives run by native people, who have a better understanding of the cultural differences and who can teach the cultural ways to our youth.

I just wanted to mention, for Marlene Antoniow, our health promotion practitioner, her concern is the lack of funding from the Ministry of Health. All the funding she receives is from special projects. I think we all feel that the funding should be long-term. Thank you.

Ms Coulis: I am Terry-Lynn Coulis, the referral worker at the Indian Friendship Centre. One of my concerns is, what do we do with our elders if they do not fit into the perfect criteria that are asked by a home for the aged? I feel that because facilities are government-funded, they should not have the right to refuse anyone, and they do. If you do not fit into their perfect mould they refuse you, and those people end up in chronic care units at hospitals, which becomes more of a burden. This city really needs a facility for people who do not fit into that mould.

Another concern I have is that this city really needs a place for family crisis. Rather than just women or men, there needs to be some sort of facility to put a whole family that is in crisis, whether it be accommodation, fire or whatever. We find often that there may be a whole family that is in a crisis situation and has nowhere to go; often we can find a place for the mother and the children but the father is usually left sleeping in the car or wherever because there just does not seem to be anywhere they can go as an actual family. That is all.

Mr Offer: First, let me thank you for coming to the committee to tell us of the Indian Friendship Centre and tell us some of the concerns you have. Some of the issues you have raised are ones which certainly we are going to have to deal with as we go through our hearings, especially the whole question of the preservation of language, in this case the Ojibway language. That issue has been brought forward to us on a number of occasions now, and I believe that is something we are going to have to deal with as we go through this committee.

There are a number of Indian friendship centres throughout the province, and I am wondering if you could share with us whether there is any dialogue or co-operation between individual Indian friendship centres, sharing some of the concerns, sharing some of the needs. If there is, how are they brought forward?

The second point I want to raise by way of question—because probably the Chairman will cut me off after the first question so I thought I would just flow right into it—could you share with us in a very fundamental way some of the difficulties you are facing in the centre, some of the difficulties that people are bringing forward as they come to the centre? I know you have brought forward some of the issues which are of concern to you, but is there something of a fundamental underlying nature that might be and should be very helpful to us?

Ms C. Harrington: I am the old lady, so they are letting me go first. I will speak to the first part and the rest can speak to the second.

We have a very strong federation, the Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship Centres. I will speak in its praise first, and then I will say a few negative things about it. They do bring us together quite often for workshops, individual programs and co-ordinated programs where we all go down; for instance, we are going next week to Toronto. We have an opportunity to exchange ideas with each other and to sort of get the word from the top as well. Yes, there are a lot of back-and-forth discussions, and we do get to know our peers in the other friendship centres. We are widely scattered so it is hard to get together other than that. They funnel us twice or three times a year through Toronto.

The negative is that very often policies are set between the Ontario federation, which is in Toronto, and yourselves without consulting the people who are actually in the field; and because they do not have specific people in education, say—that is my particular interest—within the Ontario federation, they will just pick someone from staff to go on that committee, and we are back in Sault Ste Marie saying: "Hey, we're the ones who know the conditions. We know

the concerns. We know the individuals. Why are we not being brought into these talks?" I know there are money constraints and you cannot bring us all down and talk to us all, but if you can fund something like this, perhaps you could send one person up to talk to us, the people who actually work in the field. So there is the good and bad of it.

1620

Ms Coulis: Usually when people have concerns I am the person they send them to. One of the biggest concerns, and I get many, many phone calls, is the interpretation of tax exempt and especially how the GST is applying to that. I get many calls saying, "This store has refused me." There seem to be many interpretations of how it is to apply. There was nothing really cut and dried or clearly set out, and that seems to be one of the biggest concerns right now. I cannot think of anything else right off the bat.

We get a lot of requests for emergency housing or emergency money and it is something that we do not have in our centre. It would be something that we would like to see, some sort of fund to draw from. Sometimes somebody only needs maybe \$10. It is quite a process to have to refer them to city welfare and often they are denied for one reason or another. Sometimes, you know, a lot of times these people are not asking for you to give it to them but to loan it to them. If we do, by some chance, have some petty cash and lend it, often we get it back. In fact, I would say more often we get it back. The person will come back.

The thing about welfare is that often if they are going to talk to you, they want you to have a place of residence for them to be able to come to your place of residence. But if you do not have any money, getting a place of residence is almost impossible, and it is kind of putting the cart before the horse. That is something we run into often.

Ms Chevrier-McLeod: One of the concerns that I as a criminal court worker deal with that comes to mind is the fact that there is not any native liaison. The city of Sault Ste Marie's jail depends strictly on volunteers and there is no funding available. It is my understanding that there is a process going on right now to try to secure funds for a native liaison worker but as yet nothing has happened in that regard at all.

Mr Martin: I have listened very intently to what you had to say this afternoon and certainly see all that you have to say as symptoms of a system that is radically and fundamentally wrong in terms of your ability as people to reach your potential and participate fully in our community. My own experience with native people over the last years that I have lived in the north has been one of real awe, because I think you have so much to teach us in terms of community and how you live as a community and some of the values that you hold so near and dear.

I watch you struggle with that and I know that as native people you live very much on the energy provided by dreams that you have. You are great dreamers, and I think at this time in our history as Canadians, we need to be challenged by dreams, by visions of ways that we might be together. I thought for a minute I might invite you to, if you can—I know it is not that easy in this kind of a forum

to share in that way—maybe challenge us a little bit and give us a little bit of your understanding of what Canada could be like in the best of all possible worlds for you as native people, so that we might also roll a little bit on the energy that that will give to us as a committee as we struggle with where we are going as a country?

Ms Chevrier-McLeod: Again we will call on Carolyn.

Ms C. Harrington: When in doubt.

Here we came prepared to be very, very negative. We did not come prepared to be pleasant. This will get me starting to think pleasantly. I would like to, first of all, thank Tony. He is talking about the value of community. Tony, our new MPP, has moved into our neighbourhood with his offices, and I think that is a very, very strong statement. We thank you, Tony, very much for that.

Okay, positive, Carolyn, think positive. I think we are seeing—we are not just dreaming—we are starting to see the actual things that we can be. Speaking for education, we are seeing people now not just staying in elementary school, staying in secondary school; we are working now on how to keep people staying in university so that they go on and become what they can be at that point.

Things are starting to happen. We are getting housing programs, and all these things that we have been working at at the bottom levels are starting to take effect. Maybe now that we are not having to worry about what we are going to eat and where we are going to sleep, we can start dreaming about where we would actually like to go with this when we are equal with other people. That is the most positive thing I can think of to say.

Ms Ouellette: I really feel that the schools should be allowed to have a cultural class for their native youths, because that is where it has to start. Our young people have to be taught about the old ways. I know for me it has just been in the past couple of years that I have been able to come back into touch with my own culture. I feel it is a beautiful culture and I really feel that I have grown a lot from it. It is really nice to be able to work with the Indian Friendship Centre and come in touch a lot more with the native people and the elders.

I am finding that still a lot of times people are thinking that just because our culture is different, it is bad. We have to change these attitudes, you know. We have a lot to share with people, and I think native people are really open to sharing these things with other people. If people would just keep more of an open mind—you are more than welcome to attend our social ceremonies. We have a lot of powwows and stuff and you are more than welcome. That is where it starts.

Ms C. Harrington: Just one of the components of being a criminal court worker is to educate our community, and by doing this, we put on four workshops per year. Recently, we had a workshop at the Indian Friendship Centre and we had grades 6, 7 and 8 invited. I would like to share with the committee the fact that we

did some really serious teaching about—it was called Justice: It's Not Just Us Any More. It is not the law against us as being native people, taking responsibility.

Some of the comments were very, very positive. And I think one of the components of the workshop itself was the fact that we had treated those children as equals. We did the traditional handshake ceremony where we in turn greet one another. I guess you would have to participate in one to really know what I was talking about, but some of the children were non-native and they really felt they learned a lot because they got to be themselves. They were not in a strict classroom environment with the teacher at the front dictating what they should know.

That is one of the things that we as a people can add to the non-native culture and community, for the general population to realize that we are a unique people and we do have a lot of things that we would like to share and continue to share.

Mr Eves: I wanted to clarify something I thought I heard, that you do not have a native court liaison officer. Is that what you said?

Ms Chevrier-McLeod: Right, at the district jail here. We do not. We have one presently working as a volunteer. She is a student like Gayle, in the same native community worker program, and she is trying to put forward a proposal for funding, I guess more or less to secure herself a job when she graduates, but it is a good start.

Right now they are depending on volunteering. There is a process of offering tobacco, in order to get an elder to come into the jail, that a lot of the non-native people do not understand. You cannot just say, "Hey, Mr So-and-so, can you come down to the jail?" You have to offer them tobacco first. So there is kind of like a traditional way of going about it that a lot of people are not aware of.

1630

Mr Eves: That is a very worthwhile need and one that I think all members of the committee would be very well advised to pursue.

Speaking of sharing cultures and imparting native culture not only to your own youth, I know that the Indian Friendship Centre in my own riding of Parry Sound is a very active one indeed. Speaking on a positive note, I know that it has helped me a great deal in my role in the last 10 years as a member of the provincial Legislature to become quite involved in a process which they call—and maybe you have the same process—native awareness days. A week out of every year or perhaps more, they take this period of time not only to make their own youth aware of your culture and your heritage, but also, just as important, to have a sharing of cultures between the native and non-native communities. I think we could all learn something from that.

Ms Chevrier-McLeod: Yes, sharing is a very important part of our culture. One of the main components is sharing.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I am sorry, we are going to have move on. We do have a couple of other presenters. Thank you.

ALLIANCE SAULT-CANADA

M. le Président : Je voudrais appeler Max Iland.

M. Iland : Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, mesdames, mesdemoiselles, messieurs, au nom de l'Alliance Sault-Canada, un organisme fondé par les francophones de Sault-Sainte-Marie, afin de révoquer la résolution unilinguisme anglais passée par le conseil municipal de la ville, permettez-moi de vous souhaiter la bienvenue, ceci dans une ville qui, regrettamment, par l'entreprise de son conseil municipal, a fortement contribué au déchirement qui étreint notre pays.

Nous sommes une association qui s'est créée par un cri du coeur, une réaction à l'odieux du geste qui s'est perpétré ici. La présence francophone à Sault-Sainte-Marie remonte à l'époque de la découverte et de l'exploration du Canada. Les premiers européens qui ont payé le long de la rive sur laquelle la ville est située étaient francophones. Leurs voix et leurs chants ont résonné dans la région. C'est d'eux que nous vient le nom de la ville.

Depuis cette époque et jusqu'à récemment la ville n'a cessé d'être un milieu où la francophonie et ses membres se sont épanouis. En ce faisant, nous avons établi des écoles, des paroisses et de nombreuses organisations d'ordre social et religieux. Ces écoles, ces paroisses et ces organisations ont fortement contribué au bien-être de chacun, anglophones et francophones. C'est un historique que nous voulons maintenir dans le présent et dans l'avenir, historique qui nous permet de regarder un passé dont nous sommes à juste titre fiers, et un avenir dans lequel nous voulons maintenir cette fierté et notre contribution entièrement positive.

Aujourd'hui autour de nous, de près ou de loin, nous voyons un pays magnifique, à tout point de vue, en proie à des angoisses et à une crise d'identité, une crise d'identité que la province de Québec n'a pas vécue, au contraire. Cette crise est le reflet d'un manque de leadership venant du gouvernement fédéral, qui représentait cet échec par l'échec du lac Meech, par l'aliénation des provinces de l'Ouest, par le soulèvement des autochtones, par le mouvement souverainiste du Québec. Tous ces faits jouent un rôle ; ils sont le miroir d'un peuple en désarroi, sans guides ou lignes de conduite. C'est l'heure où ceux qui ont le potentiel, le désir, qui sentent le devoir d'agir doivent se lever hautement et participer dans la pleine mesure de leur capacité à des actions qui maintiendront la Confédération canadienne intacte.

Nous sommes convaincus que la province de l'Ontario, la plus peuplée, la plus riche, incorporant sur son territoire la capitale fédérale, Ottawa, et la ville canadienne la plus grande, possédant la puissance industrielle la plus forte, touchant aux frontières de deux provinces avec la plus grande population francophone hors Québec, cette province, ayant reconnu ses concepts qui enrichissent, c'est-à-dire ceux des deux peuples fondateurs, du multiculturalisme, des droits des autochtones, cette province, par ses antécédents se doit d'agir dans le sens le plus

large, le plus complet et le plus entier. Ceci, afin de s'assurer et de faire en sorte que les fissures s'agrandissant journallement ne mènent à une brèche que nul ne pourra colmater, et que ce vaisseau sur lequel nous naviguons ne disparaisse à jamais.

Dans la Confédération canadienne, la province de l'Ontario est celle qui s'est trouvée la meilleure niche, ceci peut-être à cause de sa situation géographique qui la place au centre du pays, mais également à cause de la diversité de sa culture faite de nombreux immigrants d'origines différentes, des deux peuples fondateurs, des autochtones qui eux aussi ont un rôle d'envergure à jouer. Tout déchirement, tout changement constitutionnel autre que ceux faits à l'unisson nous touchent directement et nous toucheront en proportion directe. La présence d'un demi-million de francophones en Ontario indique combien est important l'avenir de la province pour les Franco-Ontariens. Dans un sens plus direct, la survie des Franco-Ontariens est un autre avis incontestablement liée à un Canada uni, reconnaissant la richesse que représente la diversité de notre peuple tout entier, que l'on parle des autochtones, des ethnies ou des peuples fondateurs. Ceci forme ce qui est ce qu'on a appris à nommer la mosaïque culturelle canadienne.

Il y en a parmi nous qui voudraient diminuer et éventuellement éliminer l'importance de cette mosaïque ; nous n'y croyons pas. Le gouvernement ontarien a dans le passé supporté cette mosaïque. Nous en sommes heureux. À l'avenir nous désirons voir cet appui s'affermir afin que l'épanouissement des Franco-Ontariens aille de pair avec celui des autres segments de notre société. Nous demandons la promotion de la dualité linguistique dans la province et ceci en dépit de certains ; nous demandons la reconnaissance des droits inaliénables des Franco-Ontariens.

1640

Notre réaction au document de consultation, Changement et renouveau, est la suivante : la province de Québec a toujours été une société distincte. Aujourd'hui sa culture est riche et féconde. Les arts et les lettres sont florissants. Cette société, introduisant une diversité nouvelle, enrichit énormément la nôtre, les francophones hors Québec ainsi que les anglophones. Nous espérons que dans un Canada uni, nos gouvernements sauront trouver le mot juste afin de permettre au Québec de continuer de fleurir dans une Confédération saine et vigoureuse. Les autochtones eux aussi constituent une société distincte. Nous souhaitons voir ce peuple des premiers canadiens éclore à une vie et à une meilleure aisance. De par leur origine, ils ont des droits. Les ignorer, ces droits, ne fera que nous diminuer. Les reconnaître et leur permettre de se développer ne peut que nous enrichir. Nous préférons de loin voir parmi nous une société autochtone féconde et active, fière de sa culture et de ses origines ancestrales, à celle d'une société autochtone atrophie et qui, indirectement, aura le même effet sur la nôtre.

Pour terminer, Monsieur le Président, je désire parler d'une chose qui nous tient à coeur : la dignité humaine. Comme je l'ai dit au début de mon mémoire, les Franco-Ontariens de la ville, de la province et du Canada ont été

bafoués par la résolution unilingue de la ville. Cette même ville, en proie à des difficultés économiques considérables, près de la faillite, aujourd'hui le conseil municipal de cette ville a demandé au gouvernement son appui financier, un appui qui nous permettrait de sortir de ce marasme.

La souffrance humaine qui découle de cette situation est énorme ; adultes et enfants souffrent énormément. La misère et la dignité est parfois inconcevable, mais ça existe. Et c'est pourquoi nous supportons intensément toute intervention gouvernementale possible. Que ce soit de manière financière ou autre, nous la supportons. Toutefois, tout comme dans l'industrie privée, où l'individu en difficultés financières va voir son banquier afin que celui-ci puisse l'aider à remettre ses affaires en bon état, nous demandons, comme le banquier qui insisterait que d'abord toutes les fuites de capital soient bloquées, que toutes dépenses soient examinées et éliminées si elles ne sont pas absolument indispensables, que toute situation qui empêche les rentrées de fonds soit nullifiée, nous demandons que le gouvernement provincial lui aussi agisse de la même manière et qu'il demande que la ville élimine toute législation municipale qui empêche les activités économiques de la ville de s'épanouir. La première de celles-ci serait la résolution unilingue anglaise adoptée dans cette même salle le 29 janvier 1990, non pas par la majorité à la suite d'un vote en bonne et due forme, mais par une minorité agissant avec une pétition guidée par un maire et un conseil en grande partie démagogues. Tous autres gestes verront les données publiques auxquelles la francophonie contribue versées à des gens qui d'une main nous giflent et qui nous tendent l'autre afin que nous réparions le dommage que leur action envers nous a causé.

C'est pour nous une pensée intolérable. Il serait simple d'un geste de mettre les choses au clair et ce geste, c'est simplement la révocation de la résolution. Je pourrais terminer ici avec votre permission, Monsieur le Président, mais je voudrais ajouter quelques mots. Nous sommes tous, dans une certaine mesure, ce que nos expériences dans la vie ont fait de nous. Ce que nous voyons ici, nous le voyons tous en partant de notre point de vue, c'est-à-dire celui des gens qui ont vécu dans un pays et une société en général démocratique et qui ont été traités tels quels.

J'aimerais vous lire un petit texte très court qui vous expliquera mieux que je ne peux le faire mes sentiments. Bien que le texte à l'origine ne soit pas écrit en anglais, je le possède en anglais, et comme je ne suis pas absolument certain de ma traduction en français, si vous le permettez, je vais l'utiliser en anglais.

"First they arrested the Communists, but I was not a Communist so I did nothing. Then they came for the Social Democrats, but I was not a Social Democrat so I did nothing. Then they arrested the trade unionists and I did nothing because I was not one. And then they came for the Jews and the Catholics, but I was neither a Jew nor a Catholic and I did nothing. At last they came and arrested me. There was no one left to do anything about it."

The author, ladies and gentlemen, is Rev Martin Niemöller. Martin Niemöller is a survivor of Nazi prison camps.

Suggérer que la même situation peut se produire ici, to suggest that the same thing could happen here is of course not what I want to say. I do not believe it could happen here. But I suggest very strongly, mais je suggère très fortement, that the same sentiments that have brought about those events, que les mêmes sentiments qui ont amenés cette situation, exist among those who are behind that resolution, existent derrière ceux qui ont poussé cette résolution.

As I said earlier, we are all the result of our experiences, et je ne parle pas légèrement, parce que mesdames, mesdemoiselles, messieurs, j'ai vécu ces événements. Je les ai vus avant qu'ils ne prennent lieu. J'ai passé à travers ces événements et j'en ai vu la suite. Et quand j'ai fini, ceux qui m'entouraient au début n'étaient plus présents. J'ai un fils dans cet auditoire, je n'ai pas l'intention que lui doive revoir ne serait-ce que l'ombrage de ces sentiments. Je crois qu'il est impératif que chacun de vous, que chacun de nous qui que nous soyons, que le gouvernement à Toronto fasse de sorte que ces sentiments soient coupés au pied de l'herbe aussitôt que possible et aussi courts que possible. Ils n'ont pas de place dans le Canada que j'imagine, pour moi, pour mes enfants surtout, pour la société qui nous entoure. C'est tout ce que j'ai à dire. Je vous remercie.

1650

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Iland. Il y a quelques questions, je crois.

Mr Offer: Sir, you spoke both eloquently and passionately about those issues which concern you and I trust concern so many people. Underlying all of what you have said is a value of what you carry for this province.

My question to you, and I ask for your perspective, is, is it possible that the values and the hopes and the aspirations of those of us in Ontario are not different from those in Quebec, but rather that the difference lies in many cases in that maybe those in Ontario have an assurance or a higher degree of hope that they can be achieved with a stronger federal government, while those in Quebec feel that just cannot be the case?

Mr Iland: Yes, I would think that the aspirations are the same. I also believe that Meech Lake was extremely detrimental to the vision Quebec has of the rest of Canada.

When someone is thrown outside of the house because he is different, because his culture, his language, his religion, whatever, is different, he obviously does not feel welcome any more in that house, and once you do not feel welcome, you just want no part of it. I think that is what has occurred.

I think a very important aspect of it, in my view at least, in my modest opinion, is that English Canada does not understand Quebec. I am not suggesting that there are not people in Quebec who are racist—I do not want to take the defence of those—but I think that if you examine the overall situation and the actions of Quebec, its actions, which to many anglophones outside Quebec may have appeared critical in the sense that it was a rejection of English Canada, were not so. It was instead a retrenchment or a defence of what Quebec should be to them, and that is a

French province with its culture, with its identity, with its language.

I am obviously an immigrant, and I have seen changes. I recall when I first landed in Montreal, I had a job, a summer job. I worked with students, and I remember how some of them told me, "The fact that we are bilingual makes us less likely to obtain a job than if we were unilingual English." These are people that since have become lawyers and have gone on to professions.

At that time I could not seize fully what that meant because I just got off the boat maybe a month before. Then I saw how the language deteriorated. It deteriorated because everything around Quebec is English, everything technical is English, movies in many cases are English, and so on. The influence of the English world on little Quebec is such that they have to push back. That is what it is. They have to push back in order to remain French.

I could give you many situations, sentences, where someone goes into Quebec and speaks in French. The gas attendant would come and he would use a sentence asking, "Do you want me to fill your car with gas?" The sentence used to be half French and half English. The French realized that they were losing their language and that they had to do something to maintain a clear distinction between French and English. So they worked appropriately and their actions were seen as a rejection of English Canada.

I repeat this, I am not suggesting that there are not people in Quebec who are racist. I suspect there are. There are some in every society. None of them are entirely pure. But if I may quote a young man from Three Rivers who came to this city this summer—I was in an exchange 15 years ago and I had that young man in my group—I asked him, "Aren't you concerned about coming to Sault Ste Marie?" He said, "No. For every racist that I find here, I will find one in Quebec."

So we are not that different. But my point is that when you look at the gestures that Quebec has made over the years, they were not as much a rejection of Canada as they were a defence of their own language and culture. Their gestures were misinterpreted by many English Canadians. Maybe some of them who themselves were racist used that in order to say, "See how they do?" Of course, propaganda works that way.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are going to end with Mr Iland at this point.

We have two other presenters. I gather both presentations will be brief and then we probably can break for the afternoon session at that point.

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

The Chair: I call first Bob Richards from the United Steelworkers of America.

Mr Richards: My name is Bob Richards and I am a steelworker. I would like to thank this committee for allowing me to make this presentation. I have listed a few points that I believe would make for a better Canada.

First and foremost, I believe we need to change the federal government. Brian Mulroney and his Progressive Conservative government have achieved an all-time low in popularity. This government will not listen to the people

who elected it. The Mulroney government should resign and call an election before the country is destroyed beyond repair.

Next, I think we should discontinue the free trade agreement with the United States. Ever since the free trade agreement was signed with the United States several thousand jobs in Canada have been lost. Many companies have closed their operations and moved to the US. Canadians have yet to benefit from this agreement.

Discontinue free trade talks with Mexico. If we sign a free trade agreement with Mexico, more Canadian jobs will be lost. Trying to compete with a Third World country will lower the standard of living of Canadian workers. This is nothing more than the federal government's attempt at union busting.

I feel we should lower the Bank of Canada interest rate. The interest rates in this country are too high. Working people cannot afford decent housing. Industries and businesses are closing. Meanwhile, the banks are reporting record profits and the rich become richer. The lower interest rates would allow the Canadian dollar to fall. This would let Canadian manufacturers become more competitive in world markets.

Revise Unemployment Insurance Commission legislation. The UIC rules are unfair to working people. We need to change the disqualification rules, lower the waiting period and increase the benefit period. Unemployment insurance is an insurance against loss of wages. Any person who becomes unemployed should be eligible to collect benefits.

The next point is to revise income tax rules. The majority of the taxes paid in this country are being paid by working people. Many large corporations pay little or no income tax. This must change. No more free rides for the wealthy. They must pay their fair share.

I feel we should reduce the tuition for colleges and universities. The cost of educating our young people is getting very expensive. The high cost of a post-secondary education discriminates against the children of working people. The more affluent families have no problem paying high tuition fees. Therefore, the wealthy become educated and become more prosperous.

1700

Another point is to increase the minimum wage. The minimum wage across this country is unacceptable. In Ontario, the minimum wage is under \$12,000 annually. How can a family survive on this income? It must be increased to above the poverty level.

We must protect our universal health care programs. We must ensure that all Canadians are entitled to first-class medical services. The doctor's fee or the cost of an operation should not prevent any Canadian from receiving top-notch health care.

We must protect our senior citizens. Our senior citizens built this country. We must not forget them in their later years. These people deserve our respect and our assistance. The Canada pension plan and the old age pension must meet the financial requirements of our seniors.

I feel we should drop the goods and services tax. Canadian families now find that they have to pay 7% tax on

many basic needs. Over-the-counter drugs, personal hygiene products, car repairs, legal fees, books, even postage stamps and many other necessities of life are taxed by the federal government. During this recession, many people have lost their jobs. How does the government expect these people to pay the extra costs of basic needs?

My final point: I feel that we should institute a wealth tax. To help the more affluent people pay their fair share of taxes the government should tax them on the value of their assets. This has been done successfully in other countries and I feel it would work well in Canada.

This concludes my presentation. I hope some of these ideas can be used by this committee.

Mr Bisson: I take it that as a worker you are basically feeling the effects maybe of some of the policies of governments and, overall, the ills of our economy. I get the sense from what you are saying that part of what the problem is here in regard to how people are feeling about the country is not only cultural but very deeply economical, and where we are going. I am wondering if the sense that I get from you is that you are really not sure where we are going as far as our national policies are concerned when it comes to social programs, our economy and all of those issues.

Mr Richards: One thing I want to stress, and I think I did here, is that we have to maintain our services. We cannot lower our standards as far as taking care of our senior citizens and things like this. But there are a lot of things that we have to address and we have to increase.

Services are not high enough right now. Colleges are too high. People cannot afford college now and a lot of working people especially just cannot afford to send their children to college. These are things that are going to have to be looked at. Otherwise, we are going to have a much bigger spread between the working class and the more affluent people of this country.

Mr Bisson: I think something that we hear a lot sometimes on the street, and we have not heard it so much at some of these presentations, is the sense that I get that people have some fears of what the future holds and some of that is transponding over into other issues. I am just wondering if that is what you are trying to convey to a certain extent.

Mr Richards: That is correct. Yes, I would have to agree with that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for your presentation. It was concise. We certainly know what you are thinking on a lot of issues.

I am interested in what you said about the GST. You seemed to see all of the areas in which it is touching our lives and I am glad you brought that to our attention.

I found your last statement on taxation interesting and I would like you to say a little bit more about it if you would. When you are talking about the taxation of assets, I wondered what assets you are talking about and whether you offer any suggestions regarding exemptions or thresholds or any of these other things. I wondered if you had talked about those with your co-workers.

Mr Richards: This is something that has been discussed, not at length but it is an idea. I did not come up with this idea. I have talked to other people about it. I feel that the value of a person's assets, which would include his cash, his property, any businesses he owns, the value of that could be taxed. This is done in other countries. I am not exactly sure which countries now, but I know it is done and I think it is something that should be looked at in this country. It might help lessen the burden of tax on working people and, like I said, allow other people to pay their share of taxes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Well, sir, you must be aware that certainly our residences are taxed, and many people complain to us about that a lot. Certainly the businesses are taxed, whether it be corporate business or business tax, utility tax or commercial assessment tax. So I am just wondering what new ideas—if you are thinking about, what should I say?, higher levels of when people would enter this taxation bracket, because we do have a lot of taxes now on our assets, every single one of us as Ontarians.

Mr Richards: On the municipal level?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Municipal level, right, and certainly that is because there are a lot of partnerships, particularly with provincial government programs and certainly then with federal government programs. So I just wondered what new idea you would have. Some people are saying that, as you know, we work until the middle of July before we get anything for ourselves, and that goes for each person who is a worker. The kind of tax you are talking about would seem to me to involve a lot of labour workers as well, and that is why I was kind of surprised when you expounded now what you meant by it. Like personal property and things, most of us try to attain that.

Mr Richards: My suggestion would be this would only apply to certain levels.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: That is what I wondered, if you had thought about that.

Mr Richards: Right. It certainly would not apply to people who are just struggling to get by on a day-to-day basis. This would apply to, say, people who own a lot of material things, businesses, the wealthy people. This is a wealth tax. This is what I am looking at here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay. Thank you.

Mr Richards: I have a copy of this I would like to leave with the Chair.

The Chair: Sure. Please leave it with the clerk. Thank you very much.

CENTRE FRANCOPHONE
DE SAULT-SAINT-MARIE

The Chair: I call Denise Martel.

Mme Martel: Bonjour, tout le monde. J'aimerais vous remercier premièrement d'avoir donné l'occasion aux gens du peuple, d'avoir cette occasion de faire des présentations et de vous rencontrer. J'aimerais vous accueillir aussi à notre ville de Sault-Sainte-Marie. En même temps, j'aimerais exprimer le désir du Centre francophone. Je viens en tant que

représentante du Centre francophone de Sault-Sainte-Marie.

Nous avons l'intention d'élaborer une soumission beaucoup plus longue, plus élaborée que celle que je vais vous présenter ce soir. Ce que je vais vous présenter ce soir sera très bref. Ce sont les idées principales, seulement.

M. le Président : Excusez-nous un moment, il y a un problème avec la traduction. It must be the particular device that you have. We will have to carry on and do our best.

Mme Martel : Le Centre francophone a l'intention d'élaborer une soumission par écrit que nous enverrons selon ce que l'invitation a exprimé dans l'annonce publicitaire. Alors, ce que je vais vous présenter ce soir est quand même très bref. Ce sont des idées principales. Mais nous croyons qu'il était quand même important que vous sachiez que les Franco-Ontariens de cette communauté ont une vision d'un Canada uni.

Comme Franco-Ontariens, nous avons un désir très fort de conserver l'unité de ce pays. Nous nous identifions comme Canadiens, comme un des peuples fondateurs du Canada. Nous voulons conserver cette identité non seulement pour nous mais aussi pour nos enfants, pour nos petits-enfants.

Nous reconnaissons que le Québec soit une société distincte avec des besoins différents dans la tissu de notre pays. Nous, Franco-Ontariens, ressentons plusieurs de ces besoins. Cependant, le Canada ne pourra pas survivre avec un gouvernement affaibli tel que suggéré par le Québec. Donc, il faudrait y avoir des compromis des deux côtés.

Le gouvernement fédéral, les gouvernements provinciaux de chacune de nos provinces, les gouvernements même au niveau municipal devront jouer un rôle important de leadership en organisant des programmes pour aider à sensibiliser les anglophones à nos besoins, et vice versa au Québec. Nous demandons aux Québécois de faire des efforts afin d'arriver à comprendre le Canada anglais.

1710

Le gouvernement de l'Ontario aurait un rôle à jouer aussi au niveau du système d'éducation, c'est-à-dire que l'on doit s'assurer de bien faire connaître notre tradition, notre histoire, les rôles de chacun des peuples fondateurs dans le partnership qu'on a fondé en 1867.

L'un n'aurait pas réussi sans l'autre. Il est important que tous le reconnaissent. Il faut aussi que les gens partout dans le pays soient rendus plus conscients des résultats concrets et pratiques d'un Canada divisé. Qu'est-ce que ça va vouloir dire, un Canada divisé ? Quel sera notre réalité si le Canada est divisé ? Est-ce que économiquement et politiquement le Canada restera viable ou est-ce que nous serons plutôt mangés par notre voisin au sud ? Si c'est le cas, est-ce que nous voulons demeurer dans leur «melting pot» ? Est-ce que nous voudrions accepter leurs programmes sociaux ? Pensez-y un peu.

Pensez aux programmes de bien-être social, à leurs services de santé, à leur aide aux moins fortunés, à leur système d'éducation, à leur système judiciaire avec officiers élus. Nous connaissons une réalité très différente comme Canadiens. Avant de décider qu'on veut laisser

aller le Québec, qu'on veut un Canada divisé, il faut se rendre compte de ce qui nous restera après cette division. Il est important que ces problèmes soient apportés au public pour que le public y pense, pour que le public réalise profondément quels seront les répercussions d'un Canada divisé.

Je crois que le Canada anglais a du travail à faire, c'est-à-dire qu'ils auront à convaincre le Québec que le Québec est voulu, que le Québec est membre d'une famille, qu'on veut qu'il reste, qu'il nous aide à sauvegarder la fédération.

Nous les Franco-Ontariens demandons au peuple en général de sauvegarder notre fédération. J'espère que le gouvernement de l'Ontario assumera un rôle de leadership à bâtir un nouveau Canada.

M. Beer : Merci pour votre présentation, et on est contents que le Centre francophone plus tard va aussi déposer un mémoire à ce sujet, mais je pense que vous avez quand même touché aux points importants. Je me demande si, comme membre du conseil exécutif du Centre francophone, vous pensez qu'il y a maintenant dans cette ville des gens anglophones et francophones qui travaillent ensemble pour essayer de mieux unir les gens de cette ville et si peut-être on est sur le chemin de voir une sorte de nouvelle amitié, ou de toute façon de souligner l'amitié entre francophones et anglophones. Quel est votre point de vue un an après ces relations ?

Mme Martel : Il y a certainement des gens de la communauté, des francophones et des anglophones, qui travaillent ensemble, qui communiquent pour faire des efforts de rebâtir, ici dans la communauté, les amitiés et les liens qui ont existé depuis longtemps. Il y a certainement parmi les anglophones des gens qui nous appuient. Comme francophones nous ressentons aussi qu'il y a beaucoup d'anglophones qui ont été sensibilisés à nos besoins comme francophones qui nous appuient qui, maintenant qu'ils sont sensibilisés, maintenant qu'ils connaissent beaucoup plus nos problèmes, dédoublent d'efforts pour nous faire de la place, pour nous accommoder. Par contre, il ne faut pas le nier, il y a des anglophones qui ne reconnaissent pas nos besoins, qui ne reconnaissent pas nos droits. Mais il y a un noyau qui travaille pour nous.

J'aimerais bien voir le leadership de cette unification entre les deux groupes, anglophones et francophones de la ville, venir du conseil municipal. Jusqu'ici nous ne l'avons pas vu.

M. Bisson : C'est un point qui est intéressant. Vous dites dans votre discours que l'important est que le restant du Canada reconnaisse que le Québec est différent sur certains points. Mais en d'autres mots, vous dites qu'il est important que l'on a besoin d'un gouvernement qui est très centraliste, très fort au fédéral pour être capable de garder le pays ensemble. Je comprends, il faut le dire mais à quel point, quoi qu'on dise au Québec, parce que le Québec a des demandes comme celles-là ? A quel point nous, le restant du Canada, s'en va-t-on envers ces demandes, puis à quel point eux ont-ils besoin de venir vers nous là-dessus ? Avez-vous des idées là-dessus ? Je pense que c'est ça ce que le monde se demande.

Mme Martel : Bien, je pense qu'il est nécessaire de connaître les besoins du Québec qui ont un rapport direct avec sa survivance, et puis nous comme francophones en Ontario ou hors du Québec de reconnaître nos besoins pour survivre. Par exemple, la négociation de l'entente qui vient d'être signée par rapport à l'immigration, je crois que c'est un point important qui va aider à faire survivre la culture des Québécois et certainement il y a d'autres domaines qui sont directement liés à la survivance de la culture comme telle.

Mais je suis certaine qu'il y a beaucoup de domaines et je ne connais pas les 21 ou 22 points qui ont été demandés dans les recommandations du rapport Allaire, mais j'ai l'impression, disons, que ça ne serait pas nécessaire de faire des compromis sur les 22 points, parce que si chaque province aurait le droit de mener ses affaires, de se gérer à ce point, nous n'aurions plus un Canada. C'est un Canada divisé, c'est un Canada affaibli. Alors, si on peut faire des négociations, si on peut examiner chacun de ces points individuellement pour voir jusqu'à quel point ces demandes affectent la survivance de la langue, des traditions, de la culture des francophones au Canada, je crois à ce moment-là qu'on va être capable d'arriver à un compromis de quelque sorte, mais il faudrait prendre les points individuellement.

Mr Martin: I find the whole question very challenging, and I would say that probably Sault Ste Marie very much reflects the challenge that is out there in Canada. I do not think we are really all that much different. We have this resolution that has gotten in the way of some discussion happening. I really appreciate the conciliatory tone of your presentation. You are talking about compromise, and discussion and finding common ground.

I heard a presenter earlier this afternoon talking about how destructive ultimatums and deadlines are in trying to come to some resolution of a challenge as big as the one in front of us as Canadians today, and that certainly faces us here in Sault Ste Marie. We only have to look to the newspapers every day to realize what ultimatums and deadlines bring us to—the Gulf, for example. When we set deadlines and make ultimatums and are not willing to negotiate, we end up throwing bombs at each other and ultimately everybody gets hurt.

I heard Max, and I have to be honest here. The challenge, to me particularly, because I am a local politician and my style may be different than some others—"The resolution must be rescinded before we can do anything else" sounds like an ultimatum. "Meech Lake: either you accept it or you're saying goodbye to Quebec." That kind of attitude does not, I think, bring us to a place where we can do what you are calling us to do. Would you like to expand on that a little?

Ms Martel: I am not sure just what you are looking for.

Mr Martin: Is there room for us at this point in our history, both as people who live in Sault Ste Marie and as

Canadians, to find that common ground where we can talk without setting ultimatums and deadlines?

Ms Martel: I think there is room, I really do. I believe that. I think there is a possibility. I think that what happened in Sault Ste Marie—unfortunately, there was not open discussion before the resolution was passed. There was no opportunity to clear up misinterpretations, apprehensions, false information. That opportunity was not there.

In establishing this commission, the Spicer commission, the federal government and the provincial government have afforded the opportunity for people to dialogue, to speak to each other, to communicate their needs. We have to be able to talk to each other and we have to be willing to listen to each other. If we get ourselves stuck in a place where we cannot see, we are so concerned with our own needs, and where we are that we cannot hear each other, then we are going to have difficulty coming to somewhere in the middle where we can compromise.

But I really believe we can do it and this sort of forum is going to enable us to do that, it is going to help us get there. This is perhaps the leadership position I alluded to earlier as far as municipal council is concerned. It would be wonderful if our municipal council, as leaders of this community, would initiate that sort of dialogue between the anglophones and the francophones. It is by speaking to each other, it is by communicating with each other that we learn what each other's needs are. Once we understand the other person's position, we are much more willing to make a compromise and say: "Okay, well, now I understand your position, we'll give a little. Let's see if we can find something that will accommodate both of us." But there has to be that dialogue and there has to be that willingness to listen.

Mr Bisson: It really heartens me that in the four days we have gone through to hear what some of the people have been saying is the common sense. There is a thread going through this whole thing, and I really feel positive, because people are basically saying the same things but in a different way. It is almost as if people are walking along a parallel path, unwilling to look at the other side. I hope at the end of this process that we can get people to join at the other end. It really excites me to hear everything we have heard in the past four days and what you just said. I believe there is hope. There has to be.

Ms Martel: I sincerely believe that if we all think positively, if we all believe we can, then we can.

The Chair: Good, and we will all keep trying to find those points where those roads can meet. Thank you very much.

We will recess at this point and come back at 7 o'clock for the evening session.

The committee recessed at 1724.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1911 in the Civic Centre, Sault Ste Marie.

The Chair: Good evening and welcome to those of you who are here in the hall. We are continuing our hearings as the select committee on Ontario in Confederation this evening from Sault Ste Marie in the council chambers. We heard from a number of people this afternoon and have a number of speakers to hear from this evening.

I would like to ask the people who are going to be talking to us this evening, because we have a number of people we have had to add to the list as well, in order to give as many people as possible an opportunity to speak, we would appreciate it very much if the presentations could be kept to a maximum of 10 minutes for individuals and a maximum of 20 minutes for groups. If you would allow us some time within that as well for some questions from the members of the committee, we certainly would appreciate that as well. We realize that that might cause a few problems and apologize for those. We are trying to give as many people as possible an opportunity to speak to us.

While we certainly anticipate that in these kinds of hearings we will hear a number of things that are obviously on people's minds that may or may not have to do with our mandate, we would like to ask that people try to maintain their comments to the issues that we need to discuss. If there are problems that you want to bring to our attention around other issues that really are not within our mandate, while we will not cut you off, we really would appreciate it if you could keep the comments to the context of the question of the Constitution issues, realizing that that is a very broad spectrum and not attempting in any way to limit the discussion on those issues.

JERRY FROST

The Chair: I would like to proceed at this point and call Jerry Frost to come forward.

Mr Frost: I want to talk about several issues. I do not think there are enough interpreters in the Sault. I wanted to go to college to become a mechanic which was a two-year course and I was not able to get an interpreter. I finally had to bring somebody in from the United States, but the sign language in the United States was different from here.

During this meeting today I have seen a lot of people fighting over language, but with deaf people I think it is important that we keep the langue des signes québécois as well. I do not think we should discriminate against French deaf people. I have met a lot of French deaf people who use LSQ. When I was in the Belleville school for the deaf, I was not even given the option of learning French or French sign language because the government made decisions on what I could learn, and now I do not have the opportunity for education.

When I went to school in Belleville or Milton, for example—I think that now they should have American sign language in the school so that the deaf people can learn in ASL. When I was small, when I was a kid, all they did was try to use the oral method, which is speaking and

the teacher would repeat the same thing 5 or 10 times—for example, say over and over again the word “mother.” That is not education. We did not get any education. I have real complaints about the educational system in that way. In fact I feel that I was not educated. I certainly do not have adequate education at all.

I used to live up in Thunder Bay and I remember when I lived up there, and I am sure it is the same in the Sault, I went to apply for car insurance. When I went to one of the companies and filled an application saying that I wanted insurance, I of course indicated that I was deaf. As soon as I did that, they said the price of insurance would be extremely high, much higher than anybody with hearing.

I should be treated as an equal citizen. I drive just as well as somebody who has hearing and there is no reason why I should have to pay higher insurance rates just because I am deaf. I only need my car so that I can get back and forth to work, just like anybody else. I am not going to be driving carelessly just because I am deaf.

In the Sault, Thunder Bay, wherever I have gone, having spoken to other hearing people, for example, I have found that compared to deaf people, a lot of hearing people have not known a whole lot about mechanics, which I know a lot about. I see people tend to educate hearing people much more than deaf people. Hearing people are given favouritism on the job. It is discrimination.

I am a mechanic and I have gone to school trying to learn to become a mechanic. It is a field I am interested in, but it is really difficult because a lot of the time they use things such as videotape or printed material in English. They feel that deaf people are not going to be able to become mechanics because they cannot hear. What is important is that we can see. We have got eyes. We can see the world visually. I do not care whether I cannot hear spoken language. I can still do the job, and that is what is important.

If you go to a movie theatre, you may all go to the show, but we do not. There are no captions in the movie theatres. Why should I go there? It is not accessible to me. Now with the time of recession I certainly cannot afford that.

That is all I really wanted to say. Thank you very much.

Mr Malkowski: You said that you wanted to see the recognition of the rights using a sign language interpreter. Does that mean in the courts or in programs? Where would you like to see ASL and LSQ?

Mr Frost: Definitely, for example, if you have to go to court. I think that if the police come up to somebody who is deaf and start talking to somebody who is deaf, they are not going to understand what is being said. I feel they discriminate against deaf people. They do not care what I have to say and they do not listen to what I am saying because I am deaf. If there is a car accident, they listen to what the hearing person said happened, not to me, because they cannot talk to me.

I have seen the police officers write down a report and pass it to me. I do not understand the English words, so I guess that the hearing guy must have said the truth and I agree to it. Then I find out that I have been charged. There was no interpreter involved. Nobody was there to present the information in my own language. That is not right. Hearing people use English language that I do not always understand. I am not very good in English so sometimes I do not understand the written word.

JIM HILSINGER

The Chair: I call next Jim Hilsinger.

Mr Hilsinger: Good evening. I am a resident of Sault Ste Marie and a firm believer in the attitude that crisis creates opportunity. I would like to think that eventually Sault Ste Marie could become a positive force towards a gentler, more sensitive Canada, especially since we have a historical location at the centre point of Canada. I do not have any answers at this time. I have only observations that could produce some insight.

We tend to blame the media for our current problems. Instead, in Canada, I would like to point fingers at some of the politicians. It seems that in the drive to create revised constitutions, new symbols of unity, new images of a bilingual Canada, politicians across the country try to force square pegs into round holes. Rather than allowing the French fact to blossom and mature through younger generations growing up with more worldly visions and adopting the joys of French culture and language, we make older people uncomfortable and insecure.

1920

Assertive action towards a bilingual Canada was definitely necessary to a point in the past, but when people perceive that their jobs and futures are at risk, because they do not speak French, they get nervous. We may have pushed too fast and too far. When people perceive excessive costs of translated documents or French services, while being badgered for higher taxes, they react with understandable concern.

These are simple, honest reactions to a system which is force-feeding a populace unwilling to change anything in their lives too quickly. We cannot convince a large part of the people in this country during the life of one government. It is going to take generations. Excessiveness and intolerance are condoned by politicians from all regions of Canada, responding to political opportunism, not the limits and values of average people.

The failure of the Meech Lake accord is an example of a political condition which was aligned with a political agenda, a politician's agenda, instead of a public's ability to accommodate change. The Meech Lake accord contained its own seeds of destruction. It is fortunate it did not become constitutional law, because it would have been another artificial level of existence for all Canadians.

It happened at a time when the North American economy was and still is undergoing a major restructuring and, while many people in Canada like to use French people or English people or bilingualism or Bill 178 or Bill 8 as scapegoats, the bottom line to their proposals and concerns is economics. People and their ideas are driven by the

dollar, by jobs, by quality of life, and the Meech Lake accord did not bolster these relationships for many Canadians. On this plane of understanding, there are many regional, north-south economic relationships which are much more rational than force-feeding an east-west economic relationship in Canada.

Even though Quebec has contributed its share to the divisiveness in Canada, Quebec has perhaps advanced an agenda for everyone, more than most Canadians realize. It is attempting to regionalize its economics and control for its own future. It is trying to do what many corporations prefer, to shift control to the level of responsibility. If the west, the east, Ontario, the midwest and the territories were to do the same, perhaps a more natural relationship of control of destiny, of control of economics and a freedom to pursue one's destiny would result.

Regionalization, demassification, globalization of society is occurring with rapidity in various dimensions. The ways we are governed have not changed for hundreds of years. We see globalization of economies and world order at the same time as we see a struggle by societies to protect their legacy of history and culture, at the same time as we try to make government more responsive.

A revised Constitution must cast aside some symbols of the past for opportunities of the future. It would be reasonable to expect a Constitution to solve our future needs, including less government and bureaucracy, rather than support outdated historical fixations. The main contribution other parts of Canada can make to Quebec and vice versa would be to interpret the job ahead, not as a threat to our future but as a future to be deliberated to everyone's benefit.

Regionalization, if it occurs, should apply equally to all those who wish. We should all be buying in, not buying out, which brings me back to politicians and the way they overstate and negatively pursue their political agendas, and I might include some federal bureaucrats. If we, as individual citizens of Canada, understand that we have more pliable and tolerant views and attitudes that can successfully define a constructive Canadian relationship, we must be offered the forums, like this one, and the encouragement to seek one another for dialogue.

The politicians must abandon brinkmanship to the preference of real people talking about and discovering opportunities, both through their similarities and their differences. Economics will ultimately influence people's decisions, but most Canadians have a humane intelligence. Genuine heart-to-heart dialogue can help to define new dimensions for Canada.

Ms Churley: Thank you for your presentation. You mentioned several things but I think I am only allowed one question, so I will focus on what you said. Earlier on, I believe you said that governments are moving too fast on this issue and that we should just let the natural process happen.

I guess it has been my experience that people who are in positions of power and privilege do not give it up very easily. I speak about that from a feminist viewpoint as well, and you could bring it to native rights and deaf rights and all of what you call special-interest rights. But I believe,

above all, as I think we all do, in equality. I think that you said that too, but we differ. I believe that governments do have a role to play because I have seen and we have seen through history that, yes, economics determine a lot of our actions. I think in a lot of cases that is unfortunate, if you look at the environment, for instance, and many other issues.

So I differ with you and I just want to know how you react to that. I believe that governments have to regulate and, yes, infringe on people's privileges and powers sometimes, because I do not believe unfortunately that it happens fast enough naturally. Yes, I believe that we have to dialogue and hear as many opinions as possible, but if we are to be fair and reach equality, how are we ever, ever going to do it unless we regulate to a certain extent?

Mr Hilsinger: I think it matters a lot what you define as equality and I think that I am going to revert to my first statement. I do not have any answers. I am probably one of the most proactive people that you will ever find and I get myself into a lot of trouble because of it. On the other hand, I struggle like you do, because I think things are right and there are certain values and principles that I apply to the things that I consider important. I think an awful lot about things before I say them.

It is a hard time. It is a difficult position to know when to not push too hard and further or when to back off or when you have maybe achieved the balance and people have to catch up. I do not really have the answer. I just try to apply sensitivity to it. I find that quite often the political agendas, because of a sort of leftist urging, will run ahead of what ordinary people really think is important or can be achieved.

Furthermore, they are prompted by a certain degree of brinkmanship, getting ahead of the other person, and no groups seem to come together and negotiate what is a fair condition for a group of people in Canada, in a province, in a federation. Consequently, the snowball gets bigger and bigger, rather than measuring up to what most people really need in their lives.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. We will have to move on.

1930

RON YURICK

The Chair: I call next Ron Yurick. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Yurick: My name is Ron Yurick and I am from Chapeau, which is a small town halfway between here and Gilles's home base.

I do not speak for any particular group but from conversations I have had with many people I think I am not alone in some of the things that I will be saying.

I read in your book the statement that many Canadians have a strong sense of regional identity. Well, I was born in Ontario, raised here and educated here all the way through to graduate school. Almost all of my employment has been here and I have spent almost all of my 40 years in this province. Yet if I were to fly a flag, I would not fly the flag of Ontario; I would fly the flag of Canada.

Indeed I would find it easier to go to some other province and feel citizenship there, feel some community with

those people than I feel now for the province, or have ever felt for the province of Ontario.

Let me explain that a bit. I grew up in the Thunder Bay area. I saw the grain from the west going to market, the iron ore going to steel mills, the other minerals taken from the ground and shipped away, the products of forests and paper mills all leaving our territory. And I saw the return: In return I saw manufactured goods coming back to us.

I felt some kinship and sorrow for the prairie farmers, for other people who live out of the centre of mainstream Canada, because they were buying the combines that were overpriced because of tariff barriers that protected Canadian industry, and as those industries grew stronger, more and more power accrued to the centre of Canada.

Northern Ontario has a history of resource extraction towns, many of them depleted—Geraldton, Cobalt, countless other mining towns and bush camps and sawmills that have sprung up all over the place, cut for a few years, milled for a few years, and just died with people being rooted out of the ground, out of their communities. Little economic opportunity is found here. There are few jobs, and perhaps most hurtful to many of us is that a lot of our children have to leave for the urbanized south in order to get a future.

Meanwhile in the south in Ontario, the mainstream of Ontario, you use the minerals, the petroleum, the wood fibre that comes in from the rest of Canada and you mill it and process it, and now when you cannot use it any further you want to ship it back to us in the form of garbage.

Indeed one of these presentations in my own home town referred to my area of the province as "a remote location suitable for the dumping of the garbage of the Metropolitan Toronto area."

I have personally often been envious of Manitoba, as somebody who grew up in northwestern Ontario, because it had something I did not and that was a provincial boundary and a provincial Legislature that said no to some of the things that were affecting all of us in the more remote regions of Canada.

We can extend this to a broad Canadian perspective as question 7 in your booklet does. The power of central Canada is probably too great. If we want to have a NATO low-level testing range, that is fine. We will not fly over Listowel or Metro or anywhere around Peterborough; we will send it out to Labrador and we will disturb the Inuit and the caribou and it does not matter anyway because they probably should not shoot those little critters.

We cut out mail service. There is a great rush to lower the federal deficit, so one of the things that has been tackled is mail service, but it is not done where perhaps it could best be done. It is done in the small towns of Saskatchewan and the fishing ports in Nova Scotia. God forbid the day they take door-to-door delivery out of Rosedale and put a super mailbox at the end of the street.

We also, with the great power in central Canada, still tolerate Third World conditions for our native people in many parts of this country. So I submit to you that the central part of Canada is too strong and maybe something that could be done, and I hope your committee will act on

this, is to look at some way of perhaps weakening that power.

I would like to expand a bit on an idea that comes from Clyde Wells. He talked in an interview with the *Charlotte-town* newspaper around Christmas of perhaps having some provision to break up primarily the two central provinces, but you might add British Columbia to this as well, so that their strong accumulated political power is somehow dispersed into many smaller provinces or some number of smaller provinces.

One of the most obvious areas is northern Ontario, but you could also look at what is called the Toronto-centred region, which is still different from southwestern Ontario, and in Quebec, perhaps the south shore, the Montreal urban area or Nouveau-Quebec in the north. There is no reason why these alignments would have to stay within existing provincial boundaries. Perhaps some part of northeastern Ontario, the Highway 11 corridor up from Hearst to Kirkland, would fit in with the Abitibi region of Quebec. I think in that way the power of the country will be spread around so that things would be seen to be more fair from the more remote regions, and I think that would do a better job than something like a triple E Senate.

As an anglophone, I hear other anglophones often shooting or taking potshots at French people, but they do not say Jean-Pierre there or Guy over here, they say: "Quebec, Damn Quebec. Quebec is doing this, Quebec is doing that." They forget about the French people who are part of the rest of the fabric of the country. New Brunswick and northeastern Ontario are two very large examples, but always we are nine provinces ganging up on Quebec and I think I personally feel some sorrow about that.

I would like to see some provisions—I do not know how you put this into a Constitution—but some sort of provisions and programs to promote tolerance and understanding between the founding linguistic groups: English, French and the many native dialects.

Like many Canadians, I was offended by the Quebec sign law, but I was equally offended by the Brockville flag-trampling incident and even more offended by some of the resolutions passed in Ontario municipalities that in essence said, "We don't want any French." The ignorance of the statement, "Let them go to Quebec," or even worse, "Put them on the boat to France," is not tolerable in a country.

As somebody who has not been part of the centre, whether you call that southern Ontario, southern Quebec or the English mainstream of Canada, I have also felt some kinship with people from other linguistic groups who have or look to the head of the government in this country as a monarchy. We still have the Queen of England as the chief political Pooh-Bah in this country.

I myself am of half British stock, but I am a third-generation Canadian and I am deeply offended by the fact that the head of state of Canada is determined or governed by a rule that the first-born male in some foreign, rich family happens to be our head of state and that, for example, there are Union Jacks on several provincial flags. Some people may fear cutting of our apron strings with Britain and suggest that then we would have to ride on the American

coattails, but I think it is time that we stood up and said, "No, we are Canadian and we are going to do it alone."

Lastly and very briefly, I would ask that there be some recognition in Ontario's efforts at restructuring the Constitution to try to protect the thing that keeps us alive, the very foundation of our existence. That is the ecosystem. I know that ecosystems cannot come to the negotiating table and talk to us, that trees do not speak, that spores and fish have no voice, but something has got to be done to keep that going because it is going to be here after we are gone. It is the peak of arrogance to think that we can write a Constitution for our country to say that whatever goes on within the boundaries of Canada should be just for the benefit of our species. How dare we do that? How dare we?

In summation, the points, to highlight them, are that there might be a way of making Canada more equal by dividing up the power of the central provinces to make them into smaller provinces with full powers in Confederation; we need tolerance for and promotion of the other languages and an understanding of the aspirations of all of those Canadians in those groups; we might accept that it is time we as a nation grew up and slid out from underneath the British monarchy; let's really try to do something to protect the environment.

I challenge you to look for creative solutions and to look creatively at enacting change. Nothing is impossible. The ideas of people like myself and other people who are going to speak to your committee can only be stopped by the committee's failure to look at those ideas in balance and to try to achieve their fulfilment.

1940

GAIL BROAD

The Chair: I call Gail Broad.

Ms Broad: I struggled a great deal in trying to prepare what I wanted to say tonight. I, too, growing up in northern Ontario and having chosen to live here as an adult, feel much of what the previous speaker said in terms of being left out of Canada or our voices not being heard.

I add to that the fact that I am a woman and that I also work in an area where most of my time is spent dealing with people who are living at or far below, frequently, the poverty line. I decided I would start it off with the first question and I never got beyond it, "What are the values we share as Canadians?" I am not sure what all of us as Canadians share, but I would like to share with you the values that I have for Canada and what I would like to see in a country that I would be happy living in.

First of all, I would like to start living in harmony with the first nations people of this land. They have never been recognized as having the authority to determine their own selves and their own direction, and I think it is time we began doing that. And it is not us granting them the power; it is us recognizing their power to control their own destinies.

Second, I would like to see a safe place for women to live, a place where we can be safe in our homes, in our streets, in our cities. I would like to see us being able to raise our children with a decent standard of living. I would like to see a country which is respectful of our differences,

where we value each other because of who we are and because of the differences that we have from one another, rather than trying to channel us all into being the same people and prototypes of ourselves and of our ancestors. I would like to live in a country where decent, affordable housing is a right for everyone, where poverty, homelessness and hunger are eliminated and where each person is free to choose and follow his or her own spiritual path.

In fact I find it ironic that many of the same things that I dream of for Canada I was taught as a child and they were the reasons that our European ancestors immigrated to North America 300 or 400 years ago and the reason that many people continue to choose to immigrate here with expectations that I think sometimes we are unable to meet.

So what stands between the dream of Canada and the reality that we face right now? I think primarily it is our own fear. It is our fear of having to share our privileges, of having to listen to one another, of having to work out compromises, of our having to give up something—very often, I think, an intangible something that in reality is not giving up at all but is in fact expanding ourselves.

How do we know what values we share if we do not listen to one another? I think one of the things that this committee has been doing that I heartily praise and am very pleased to see is the effort that is being made to contact groups in the community that usually do not have a voice and that are not present at forums such as this to speak on their own behalf.

There is only, I guess, one other comment that I would like to make, and that is that so far, to date in the development of Canada, we have not listened to one another. We have a wonderful thing called technology. Many of us have it in our offices. We have fax machines and we have telephone systems where we can conference call and talk to people all over the country and all over the world at relatively low cost. That needs to be offered to the people we do not usually listen to, the people we do not think we need to listen to because we already know their needs. We do not know their needs.

There are many things that the aboriginal people of this country have been able to teach us, although we have not listened too well, and one of them is that you have to walk a mile in my shoes to understand me. I think it is time that we started to walk that mile in one another's shoes so that we can listen and understand from each other and learn.

The Chair: If you will just wait, there is at least one question.

Mr Beer: Just in a sense a commentary on both this brief comment from this speaker and the one just before. I think as members of committees, we appreciate when representatives of groups come and make presentations, but one of the things that we really wanted to get, not only this week but in the weeks to come, was individuals who were coming and speaking about their hopes, their aspirations, not only to those who are here with us today in this room but to those watching.

I think that as we listened to both of you and as we have listened to other individuals, you are teaching us a great deal. I hope other Canadians, Ontarians, who are

wondering, "Should I come before this committee? Do my views mean anything?" know that they do. We are very appreciative that you both took the time to prepare the very thoughtful comments you have put in front of us. We are wrestling with so many of those same issues. There are not clear answers, but what you have said to us helps.

CHARLES SWIFT

The Chair: I call Charles Swift.

Mr Swift: Thank you, Mr Chairman, I paid heed to your opening remarks about requesting that we stick to your mandate and the subject at hand. Unfortunately I had made a call that was prompted by a newspaper ad in the Sault Ste Marie Star. I made three calls, actually, requesting such a guideline and to this date I have not received it. I have not had the opportunity to listen to any previous telecasts of the meetings. I have no knowledge of what you will entertain and what you will not. But judging from what I have heard from prior speakers, I would imagine my comments will be as acceptable as the others were.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr Swift: I hope you will bear with me if I stray off slightly, sir.

I come before you as a private citizen, although when I am not busy being a private citizen, I have two hobbies I think I should mention to you upfront so that there is no hint of deception on my part, my first hobby being that I am the president of the local riding association of the Reform Party of Canada and that I am also an alderman for the city of Sault Ste Marie. As a matter of fact these chambers are familiar to me, except not from this perspective. I usually sit where Yvonne O'Neill is sitting, and Yvonne, I must say you are lending a lot more class to that seat than it usually gets on Monday nights, so thank you very much. I will certainly treasure that.

From my 13 years as alderman, I have gained an appreciation for what the average person is thinking about how he is being governed, and I can tell you, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, it is not pretty. To say that the average Canadian is frustrated about how he is being governed would be just about as big an understatement as saying that Saddam Hussein likes setting off firecrackers.

The ex-Premier of Ontario observed at the last election that the voters were in a cranky mood. You bet they were, and with very good reason they were. They were sitting on a sharp spike, and every time they squirmed to get away from it, they would just cause themselves more pain. We have become a desperate people, and in desperation we have elected an NDP government. I say that without malice. It is something that Ontario voters had never done before, and I think it would reflect their desperation in trying something new to get away from what they were accustomed to with the old.

The question is, what would make a usually gentle and kind society become so cynical? I think the answer is that just about everything, everything that touches us or everything we come in touch with, is slipping away. I think the one at the head of the list is the economy. Our federal government is going into debt at the speed of a runaway train to the point where almost 50 cents of every tax dollar

raised goes to service an almost \$400-billion debt. The provincial government is only a modest \$2 billion in debt this year, and I must hasten to say that that is not the fault of the present government. However, I would hope they would not try to spend our way out of the poorhouse.

1950

It has got to the point where both senior levels of government have spent all the country's cash, they have loaded the plastic credit cards and are presently writing cheques on our grandchildren's bank accounts that future generations are going to have to honour.

To make matters worse, both government levels have discovered a new taxation tool called offloading. I think it is a new kind of board game they have invented, where they get to enact new laws and then offload the costs of the new regulations to the lower level of government. The trouble is, the property tax, which is seen as being the most regressive and the most unfair tax of all, is being raised more and more to fund activities not related to the enjoyment and to the upkeep of one's property.

I firmly believe that rising taxation and the soaring deficit are the root cause of most of the discontent in this country, and I fear that a major tax revolt is not an impossibility in Canada.

But we do have other frustrations. Consider the justice system, the environment, government accountability, language, culture and heritage, native rights and government credibility. There is a good one: government credibility right now is lower than Algoma Steel's credit rating. The trouble is that Algoma Steel has a chance of improving, but it does not look like our governments have that chance unless we can get back to the basics.

First of all, I think in philosophical terms, we must define what a Canadian is and how we can go about being one. Right now, I believe the government is trying so hard to be everything to everybody that we are ending up being nothing to anybody, to the detriment of all of us. I think we have to prioritize our needs. Canadians, after all, are not necessarily the chosen people of this earth. I think our expectations are way too high, and they must be moderated.

Our deficit tells us that we cannot sustain all the wonderful things we have taken for granted in this country. How do we sort out those things we think we need or want and what we collectively are willing to pay for? I can think of only one way to do that, and that is to let the people decide, through public debate and, at times, when absolutely necessary, through referenda. In other words, put government back in the hands of the people.

If one remembers the Meech Lake debate—and what red-blooded Canadian could ever forget that epitome of everything that is wrong with our present government?—we had a crap-shooting, power-politicking, egotistical Prime Minister meeting in private with 10 premiers. Out of the 11 of them, only two were willing to take the proposal back to their people for discussion, and look at how those two were treated. Premier Wells, if you can believe news reports of the occasion, threatened to duke it out in chambers with the Premier of Alberta, and the then Premier of Ontario tried to bribe him with six senators.

Everybody remembers the name Elijah Harper. He was credited with singlehandedly defeating the accord. While not trying to trivialize Elijah's heroics, do not forget it was the process of the Manitoba Constitution that required public meetings being held and everybody wishing to be heard being heard prior to an important piece of legislation being passed. At that time, certain people wanted to short-cut that provision, and it was here that Elijah cut them off at the pass, and praise be to Elijah for that. The point is that the Manitoba government was willing to consult its people. Newfoundland was willing to do the same, even though not bound by law to do so. I want the same privilege for Ontario: consultation with the people, not dictatorship by a government.

Mr Chairman, I would ask you, if you would be good enough, to tell Premier Bob that I appreciate the opportunity for myself and others to address you and, through you, him. Let him know that I will be listening to see if he is paying attention to what is being said.

In closing, I would like to paraphrase a remark made by a local candidate in the last federal election that became a slogan, in effect, when he said, "We in Sault Ste Marie are more interested in guts than Guccis." It is to be hoped that our provincial elected government shares that preference. Thank you very much.

Mr Harnick: You have raised an issue that no other witness has yet raised. I probably did not get your exact words, but what you implied was that governments cannot continue giving people everything they are now giving them. When you make that statement, are you talking about limiting or putting some kind of controls on the universality concept we have come to know in our social programs? Is that something you would be advocating?

Mr Swift: I am suggesting that we are spending more than we are taking in, at a faster rate, and if I were to do that in the supermarket when I go shopping with my cheque, I would be thrown out on my ear fairly quickly. I am not advocating anything other than that we are in a mess, we have spent our way into a mess, and we have to get ourselves out. We collectively have to decide what we want to fund, and we have to do that through the consultation process.

It is up to the people to decide what they are going to select for their shopping basket. If we think bilingualism is the highest thing on our priority list, then by all means, let's fund bilingualism. If we think health care is the highest thing on our priority list, let's fund health care. If we want education to be our number one, or a combination of any of those—but let's arrive at that in a consultative manner, not by decree or not by what is expedient for a group of people in one part of our province to push and advocate and to bully if they have to. This is a consultative process, I hope, and your success or failure will be a judge of what will happen in the future, I believe.

I certainly hope that my appearance here has not gone to waste or been a futile effort. A lot of other reports are gathering dust on shelves. If we are going to move into a place where I think we must be, back to the people and allow consultation—I am not suggesting that every piece

of legislation has to first pass through the gamut of public debate; that is not the way. But surely each community has leaders it has respect for, and these kinds of things that bother us and big moral questions that come to the fore can be debated by local leaders, by people perceived to be leaders, not necessarily the elected ones but the people who have faith in the local people, where from that grassroots up, a consensus can be gained.

If we want to keep on going in debt, I guess we have a right to spend our grandchildren's money if we feel we must. I do not believe we can, but if that is what the upshot of the whole thing is, then we will continue to do that. But surely to God, there is enough collective intelligence that we can choose and choose wisely those things we can afford. I am a practising pauper. I have been poor all my life, and I know how to choose and to stay within my budget. I have to do that. I think collectively we have to do that, and if we do not, we do so at our peril.

When we start bickering, all the things you hear now about language questions, about native rights, about the regional problems, basically the root cause is the finances, and we just have not been collectively involved in how to go about fixing up that problem.

2000

Ms Harrington: I want to assure you that our government is interested in guts, not Guccis. I believe we were elected to listen to the people and also to share power, not concentrate the power, as it has been for many years. What we have heard tonight and the previous days as well is that those who have not been included in power should be included; for instance, women, the native community.

I would also like to tell you that just in the past few months, since taking office in Ontario, I believe our government has found that not just this province but this country is in a state of drift and that there is a lack of leadership. So I would like to tell you that besides trying to share power and bring people into the stream and empower them, we also are trying to provide leadership, because there is that vacuum.

Mr Swift: May I respond to that?

Ms Harrington: I did have one question for you.

The Chair: I am going to have to ask both the members of the committee and the respondents to be brief, please.

Ms Harrington: I would like to ask you, because we are near the north and native people and there is a picture in your chambers of native people, how do you see the role of natives in our Canada?

Mr Swift: I would expect that any document that was signed on behalf of the Canadian government with the native people should and must be dealt with on its merits and done expeditiously.

Also, responding to your comments about groups you think you should hear from being women and others, you are hyphenating Canadians. You, in your way, are hyphenating Canadians, and we are all guilty of that. We are saying, "I'm English-Canadian, French-Canadian, Italian-Canadian," and you are saying "woman-Canadian" and "native-Canadian." You are hyphenating it, and I think the

power has to come from all the people, not from a woman Canadian, not from a native Canadian, but from Canadians. We must individually, regardless of what group we represent or what disadvantaged group we believe we represent, have an equal voice.

Once the native claims are all dealt with—I heard the previous Liberal Minister of Municipal Affairs, John Sweeney, a man who was well respected by a lot of municipal politicians, tell us at an Association of Municipalities of Ontario conference last year that what he saw that had been done to the native people made him cry. He certainly felt it in his heart and that feeling came across. But once all of that is settled, I believe, the native people should take their rightful place as Canadians. If we are going to have a country together, we should share it equally, and we should all share the burdens as well as the benefits of being a Canadian. I think those kinds of issues will have to be addressed. If we signed some documents which they have relied on and unfortunately have not been kept, I think that is a travesty and I think it should be dealt with with all due dispatch. That is my feeling on that.

The Chair: I will allow one last, very brief question and very brief answer.

Mr Bisson: I want to get back to the question of economics. One of the things you were saying, and I agree to a certain extent, is that we need to do a good job of managing our economy, making sure we do not spend ourselves into the grave. I agree with you. But I have a bit of a problem understanding one part. If what you are saying was advocated and was acted on, towards the consumer even, can anybody in this country afford to go out and buy a house just with cash? There are times where it is a good thing, where you need to go and get money in order to finance the things you need to do, such as a home. I am wondering at what point you are drawing that line, because what you seem to be advocating is that we run on a principle within the economy as individuals, as home owners and whatever, and as a government, that we never, never borrow any money. But the reality is that there is nobody in this audience who can live without going to the bank to say, "I want to buy my home," or to buy a car or whatever it might be. How do you see the government being different?

Mr Swift: Well, when you have put yourself in debt to the point where 50 cents of every one of your dollars is going to service—

Mr Bisson: Hang on. That is not what I am saying.

The Chair: Go ahead, sir.

Mr Swift: I thought I was answering that, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: I was not interrupting you. I was asking Mr Bisson to let you answer the question.

Mr Swift: He reminds me of one of the aldermen we have sitting next to me on Monday, a very difficult—

The Chair: They have been pretty co-operative until now. It may be the schedule that is getting to them.

Mr Swift: The point is that I live in a three-bedroom bungalow—my children refer to it as a crackerbox—and I do so because that is what I can afford and that is what I

could manage as a debt load. We have gone beyond what we as a country can manage as a debt load, and perhaps we have overbought in terms of—in my case, a house—services.

May I also say, Sault Ste Marie city council consciously said we will not raise the municipal tax this year. I am sure you are aware of what is going on in this community, even before all this befell us. We made a determination that we were not going to raise it. Some of the things we pride ourselves on doing, such as snow removal, we have cut that back. We in Sault Ste Marie have expected high levels of snow removal, and we have had it over the years. We are cutting back on that. We are cutting back on every service that is possible, and the people by and large, after consultation with them, and it has always been with their consultation, have agreed with us that tax reduction or holding the line is impossible. They say, "But if you can do it, God bless you." Generally we have met with acceptance, and I think that is what our governments have to do—say: "Let's get a grip on it here. The damn thing is running away with us."

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Swift.

SAULT STE MARIE AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: I call next Sharon Graham, president of the Sault Ste Marie and District Labour Council.

Ms Graham: First, as I look around the room, it is so great to see so many women sitting in these seats for a change.

In order to keep things brief, I am going to cut out a few things from my presentation. You all have copies. I hope you will look at the comments and review them.

As Canadians, we share many resources and programs envied worldwide. Over the past few years we have entered into areas of dispute and debate which are tearing this nation apart. If we do not pull back and regroup and revisit our vision of the future with positive, workable solutions, we can sink to depths that are frightening and more devastating.

We feel that with the pending talks about free trade with Mexico, a bit of our recent history has to be shared with you. Since I have been active in the labour council since 1983, I have had the opportunity to chair three events regarding free trade.

The first forum, "What is Free Trade?" comprised a broad-based list of 10 presenters: 4 against free trade, 3 for free trade, and 3 undecided. We thought this was a learning process for all of us and consciously endeavoured to have varied viewpoints on the subject in order to present an objective evening with food for thought for all. We had gone to a town hall meeting held by our sitting member of Parliament at that time, Jim Kelleher, who had just received the appointment as international trade minister. When he finally agreed to attend, he was very direct in his instructions to me that he would not debate the issue and would have no comments on it. We agreed to that and just wanted him there to listen to what everyone had to say. He agreed to say a few words only and acknowledge the speakers for their participation. He would not discuss free trade. The morning of the event, he cancelled.

The next year we ran a forum on alternatives to free trade. This was hot and heavy, both sides of the issue lining up and committed to their philosophy on the issue, many proponents of the deal annoyed with labour and accusing labour and like-minded groups and individuals of using scare tactics about this golden opportunity for Canada.

The third event we sponsored was having the president of the Canadian Labour Congress, Shirley Carr, come to Sault Ste Marie to talk to us about free trade. Mostly those against free trade came out to that event. When we tried to line her up on a local talk show, we were told that she would be a welcome guest as long as she did not discuss free trade. A month earlier that same year, International Women's Day, March 8, was dedicated to the topic of the impact of free trade on women. The particular reporter felt that we were doing too many things on free trade and it was no longer newsworthy.

2010

The responsibility of the media is a sticky item for anyone to challenge, but this we must, both print and electronic media. I know you cannot legislate integrity, but we hope the Ontario Press Council hopefully closely reviews some of the practices. On the national level, the CBC cutbacks are a loss to our country and as well to many jobs.

Now back to the free trade issue. Some businesses accused us of being irresponsible with our statements about what we saw in conjunction with the Pro-Canada Network as the downsides to free trade. We were dubbed by some as bearers of doom and gloom. These attitudes were frustrating at the time and have proved to be a costly mistake for Canada. Millions of our tax dollars were spent on trying to sell us on accepting free trade by many methods, all costing us, the taxpayers, dollars. A coalition of interest groups big on heart and time commitments to the issue but short on dollars got involved with the Pro-Canada Network in trying to defeat this devastating piece of legislation.

Another member of the federal government visited our city during election time. John Crosbie, the then Minister for International Trade, was speaking at a meeting of Progressive Conservative supporters and interested bystanders, of which I was one. I was appalled at the arrogance of this man to laugh and joke about not having read the agreement. That is why he hires other people, said he. All of your presenters across this province have had to put in some time and in some cases lots of reading to voluntarily come forward and present to your committee. Students in school have had to read reams of material in preparation for assignments in pursuit of a good mark. This man is being paid our tax dollars and does not make the time or effort to properly acquaint himself with a piece of legislation which has many repercussions to all of Canada. And then some politicians wonder why the Canadian public is disenchanted with the lot.

The next goody presented and force-fed to Canadians was the GST. Many of the same interest groups with broader-based coalitions worked against this tax, but to no avail. We were served up many of the same selling tactics utilized during the federal government's implementation of free trade, little notes and promises of rebates to seniors

and those on any type of government assistance—time, materials and distribution of this propaganda paid by, you guessed it, all the taxpayers again.

During this period of time, Mr Kelleher moves on from free trade—from trade minister to Solicitor General to being defeated by Steve Butland locally, to senator. In this capacity he is now replacing Pat Carney on a committee because she did not respond to an issue the way her leader wished her to. After Mr Kelleher's appointment to the newly created opening of senator—eight positions put in place to stack the Senate for passage of the GST of lots of our dollars—Mr Butland and the labour council requested a meeting with Mr Kelleher to discuss with him the views of people of northern Ontario, whom he said he represented. Well, he did not turn up at this meeting either, but he did send his regrets through a letter. To me, it is very clear that Mr Kelleher has definitely forgotten the people who at one time delivered for him and he now delivers exclusively to the wishes of Brian Mulroney.

The latest opinion polls say that people are not really affected by the GST. There really has not been a shopping cycle or long enough time to test this. Ask people six months from now and we are certain that Canadians will surely have been affected by the GST.

We doom-and-gloomers also stated a few years back that the financial policies, or lack of them, of our government of the day would diminish the middle class and make the rich get rich and the poor get poor.

Statistics Canada just released its latest findings, which confirm what many have been saying for some time. With the fragmenting of the middle class, people are hanging on, trying not to fall into the lower-income bracket and others are taking risks and endeavouring to jump up into the upper-income bracket. Labour does not take pride in saying, "I told you so." We only ask that we all listen to each other and that we work together for common goals for all of us.

With this current state of affairs, our society is eating away at our moral fibre and we are exposing the less pleasant side of our characters. It is fast becoming survival of the fittest. But where is it etched in stone that it has to be so? There are so many issues irritating Canadians right now, making some of us irrational and unwilling to compromise. There seems to be a divide-and-conquer happening within Canada. Who is it, or what force is racing Canada into this sad state of affairs?

This latest move into free trade talks with Mexico can only spell more trouble for our ailing economy. To have supposedly responsible Canadians tell us that our recession is not due to free trade but to a high interest rate and plant closures, well, we ask you: Who is setting the high interest rates and what about these plant closures? Plant closures for ever or just a move across the border opening up under the same or different names? We urge all citizens of Canada to watch these talks closely and to listen to what you are not being told rather than what you are being bombarded with, misinformation that you are paying for through your tax dollars. If it is such a good deal, why does it have to be sold to us?

While attending an Ontario Federation of Labour one-day conference on job loss and privatization and contracting out less than two weeks ago, the Globe and Mail ran a story which was read out at the conference by Leo Gerard, district 6 director of the Steelworkers. The story read, "Stelco now admits that free trade is not good for the steel industry." There was quite a reaction from the 1,500 delegates in attendance. Locally, Algoma has now said it has lost faith in it.

The governments have saturated us with advertising. It is just like McDonald's; whether we like it or not, we are going to try it. This style of government is not leadership. It is brainwashing and a total waste of our revenues, which could be better spent elsewhere.

This morning I watched Canada AM while Pamela Wallen interviewed the political pundits from the Liberals, Conservatives and New Democrats. It was clear that the three parties are not in agreement about Mexican free trade talks, war involvement or the GST poll results.

If it sounds like I am being sceptical, it is because I am and I do not make any apologies for this. The words "trust" and "politician" can hardly be said in the same breath any more, and it is the politicians whom we traditionally have looked to for leadership and guidance. Collectively, we now appear to be hesitant and cynical and looking for the hidden agenda. We see you, the new government in Ontario, as having the greatest opportunity of turning this around. You have started off by being straight and up front and we urge you to continue to do so. Perhaps by the end of your first term in office you will be able to turn this attitude of general malaise shared by many Canadians around to a positive viewpoint.

When all around you is falling apart, a survival mode lashes out. Unfortunately, you the politicians, deserved or not, are and will be more so in the future bearing the wrath of our misfortunes.

One of the ways you can alleviate some of this building distrust and negativity is by being up front with us about all things. We do not begrudge you a decent wage. You work hard and deserve it. What we do find hard to accept is some of the enhancements, most recently by the federal government, to wages and benefits, while we the workers in Canada paying your salaries are urged not to ask for decent increases. "Don't shop across the border and tighten your belts."

We all want better pensions. Most work 20 to 30 years to reach this goal and in a lot of cases receive pensions hovering around the poverty line. Granted, you have to get elected to your jobs, but you only have to have it for six years and then you have a healthy hedge of financial security in your retirement years. Politicians are running at younger ages and we the taxpayers are helping with your future. We hope you will be more attentive to our needs.

All Canadians should have the right to an adequate standard of living, food, clothing and housing. The federal government has cut back funding to social programs and policies put in place while it still collects our tax dollars for same. Their leadership has caused many social problems affecting programs. We want them to govern by the whole for the whole. The federal government continues to

fragment our mosaic. We do not want government run by reaction to polls or popular opinion; we want better and more peaceful lives.

This country is the Heinz 57 of the world, rich in heritage and many cultures. If you visit Miami and other southern locations, many signs are in Spanish. Downtown Toronto has sections with signs in Chinese and others in Italian, etc. Winnipeg has signs in French. Highway signs in northern Ontario are in French. It would appear that this signage came about based on need. How has this been accomplished? Were there problems getting this accomplished?

We do not pretend to have an answer to the language issue. While we have a policy in place through the Canadian Labour Congress which states that we are a bilingual organization, our membership is divided on this issue locally. The only observation I have about Quebec pulling away from Canada is to reiterate a well-used phrase among our union environments: "United we stand, divided we fall." We wish them well in their deliberations. As the government of Ontario, we hope you will continue to have open lines of communications with Quebec. Whatever the outcome, we cannot achieve anything if we do not talk and we do not listen.

Areas I would personally like to mention involve the move to getting people more involved in volunteering. The ads on the radio about encouraging people to volunteer with the little voice saying, "This is your conscience speaking," have me concerned. Many areas of volunteerism and fund-raising to keep programs and services and research afloat should really fall under the funding of governments.

The concerns we have discussed and those of all your other presenters must realistically involve millions of dollars. We hope through continued dialogue with the people of Ontario that you will appropriate the tax dollars and transfer payments fairly, responsibly and plentifully.

In an effort to reclaim transfer payments rightfully belonging to provincial governments from the federal government, we in labour councils across this province are in the planning stages of recruiting the mayors and reeves of our communities and labour council presidents to go to Ottawa, hopefully led by our Premier, to lobby the federal government about transfer payments. If this is successful in Ontario, then we will propose that labour councils and other groups across the rest of Canada do the same.

2020

Health care in the future is of concern to all of us whether we consciously think about it or not. Movement seems to be afoot to more ambulatory care. As this trend escalates, bed closures, job losses, quality of care and many other important factors all have to be considered. While we are also practising more and more preventive care, the results cannot really be evaluated for approximately another 20 years. If giving up good junk food—I mean, adopting better eating habits—practising safe sex, stopping smoking, curtailing alcohol, abstaining from drug use, etc, turns out not to be all that we had hoped, our health care will be severely taxed at that point in time.

Right now we have problems with long waiting lists for attention. Some Canadians race across the border to apparent greener pastures and find it costs a great deal

more or that the CAT scan they had was done on a first-generation machine and is unusable. Rehab facilities on a for-profit basis seem so attractive and appealing to our urgent needs on the other side of the border. We in Ontario want our health care facilities to be enhanced, not set aside because of the cost.

We anticipate that you wanted questions in the discussion paper answered. I know we have been taught not to answer a question with a question, but when we do not have a lot of answers, we turn to our next level of experience and knowledge, etc, and right now, folks, that is you. We can only add these concerns on to the mounds of other concerns you have building up daily.

We wish you well in your analysis of all your collected data and trust that you will come to some form of resolve late in March which will give us in Ontario some light at the end of the tunnel.

But the task does not stop there. We must dialogue with Canadians all across the country. All Canadians in whatever region they live, ethnic background or income bracket are all equals and all deserve to have a voice in the future of our nation.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I think there are a couple of questions. Mrs O'Neill to start.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Ms Graham, I do want to congratulate you because I do see here, first of all, a woman taking a very strong leadership role, a leadership role in the economy and understanding the economy and a desire to know what is going on and how free trade affects women, and certainly some of that has not been very happy news we have been seeing. I am most disturbed, as you must be, that Mr Crosbie is the person who has been chosen to go to Mexico to sit at the table on our behalf.

That all being said—and you are going to keep monitoring the GST, and I hope you will do that—I think it is also admirable that you are demanding an accounting of your politicians and of your media.

I must, however, remind you that this is an all-party committee. There was a great deal of competition among us, although we cannot do much about it, but many of us wanted to serve on this committee, and those of who are here, no matter which party, are very, very happy to be here because it is giving us an uninterrupted opportunity to hear people like you. I do feel that politicians of all parties are interested in trying to develop good leadership roles in their own community and certainly in trying to help those who come before them.

I hope you will appreciate that. That is not just limited to one party, and all individuals who serve as politicians—and many people do serve as politicians, and I am using that word by choice. I think it is important to realize that.

I just wanted to say one thing to you that you said about MPPs, provincial politicians, about pensions. Our pensions are not the same as the feds.

Ms Graham: Okay.

Mrs O'Neill: I do not know whether they ever will be, but they are not now and they certainly are a much more graduated kind of buying into the actual full benefit, so I thought you would like to know that.

Thank you again. I found your brief very informative and I intend to read it in its entirety.

The Chair: Do you want to comment at all to that?

Ms Graham: No. I have a brother-in-law who is an MLA for another party so I do admit that all parties have good points and bad points. I was not aware of the provincial one, so I stand corrected for not doing my homework on that.

Mr F. Wilson: Unfortunately, we do not have enough time to go into the detail I would like to go into on this brief you put before us, but I would like to talk to you in your position as president of the Sault Ste Marie District Labour Council and therefore the voice of labour in Sault Ste Marie. I was going to ask what role you saw organized labour taking in our consultative process here since you represent one of the voices that have very seldom been asked for and, when asked for, is very seldom heeded.

But you did mention in your brief a project that sort of caught my ear. It seemed to involve people I may know. Therefore, I wonder if you would expand on that. That is the one you were referring to about your assault on Ottawa—being facetious I know—that program.

Ms Graham: This may be a bit premature. This just was discussed at our meeting two weeks ago in Toronto. On a quarterly basis, some of you may or may not be aware, presidents of labour councils get together in Toronto through the Ontario Federation of Labour and the Canadian Labour Congress and discuss common issues in their areas and how to deal with some of them. This was actually the Windsor Labour Council that came up with this idea. I hope we have the blessing of the mayor of Windsor. He volunteered to contact all the other mayors in other communities to get together and go to Ottawa and talk about our transfer payments. That is one step.

Mr F. Wilson: That is a unique, I would think, project you have in mind. It is probably the first time I have heard that kind of a combination. Is that the kind of activity you think there should be, across a number of organizations like yours or other citizens' organization, that kind of grass-roots, direct participation?

Ms Graham: Well, lots of times you do not get access to talk to politicians. I think if you have a Premier like Bob Rae who is open to meeting with all groups of people—one of the things he mentioned was walking into an auto workers' building where he had been going for years and a man's eyes welling up and that man saying, "This is the first time we have ever had a Premier in here"—so it is a different attitude already, starting with this Premier and treating everybody as equal.

We think if we go to the federal government and it sees that there is a good cross-section of people—now labour councils are only the start; that is not to say that there cannot be other interest groups that come along once this is set out. I must say they were really interested to see if I could get our local mayor to come there because then we would be guaranteed media coverage, they thought.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS OF ONTARIO

The Chair: I will go next to Sharon Selkirk from the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Ontario.

Ms Selkirk: Good evening. Due to our time constraints, I will try and keep my remarks short. When we were called and asked to present at this committee, we were told to give our views and concerns, not to worry too much about the actual questions as long as we felt they fitted into the category.

The Chair: That is absolutely fine.

Ms Selkirk: I am here representing the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Ontario and the Sault Ste Marie Business and Professional Women's Club.

While we are going to try to address these issues on a provincial basis, we emphasize that we feel that a preplanning, co-operative effort must be made by all provinces to arrive at an effective implementation strategy on all these issues that we will present. The competition that presently exists between the provinces to arrive at similar objectives must be eliminated and replaced by a combined, co-operative effort by all provinces and territories within Canada to work towards common goals and solutions.

The information that our issues are based on was presented at annual conferences of our provincial organization and at biennial conventions of our national organization. Over the years, the Sault Ste Marie club has been directly involved, through the submission of resolutions, at both the provincial and national levels.

The Business and Professional Women's Clubs, for you who do not know, is a non-sectarian, non-partisan organization. Although Sharon Graham is a member of our organization, it is very much of one party. Our primary concern is the education, employment and economic status of women employed outside the home, and we try to address these issues on a provincial-national base and actually internationally through our various federations.

I will get down to the issues of concern. One of the major issues of concern within our organization is violence against women. During our national convention in Pen-ticton in July 1990, violence against women was selected as our service project for the years 1990-92. We wanted to create an awareness across Canada and we are in the process of planning seminars and conferences to cover this.

2030

We are also part of a group of women's groups within Ontario and Canada pressing the federal government to establish a royal commission on violence against women. From what I hear, this is probably going to take place, and we as business and professional women will be helping to host a national conference in this area.

We would urge the government to increase funding in both new and existing emergency shelters for battered women and their children to ensure their ongoing existence. Recently, it was announced that funds would be cut in this area.

We would ask the government to establish an adequate network of transition shelters and services for women throughout the province and the country, and to increase

the availability of subsidized housing to women and their children leaving such shelters.

We also feel that pornography has a strong impact on the attitude towards women. It was announced this week by the Ontario Film Review Board that it has relinquished many of its responsibilities for censorship. Ontario's adult population now has access to explicit sex films. There are a few exceptions, but that leaves you and me—Joe Public—responsible for identifying offensive materials and enforcing the removal of such.

While we recognize that legislation surrounding pornography comes under federal jurisdiction in most cases, we would urge that the government identify and establish a public educational program to raise the consciousness and awareness of the average Ontario resident about the form current pornography is taking, including not only videotapes but computer games, which I am sure many of you have seen and which are quite accessible to our children and to our homes. In this program, we would like emphasized the destructive impact of attitudes towards women, men and children through derogatory implications and symbols as well as the negative values it perpetrates in our society. This campaign could be something like our seatbelt campaign or the don't drink and drive campaign.

Sexual harassment in the workplace is another form of violence against women. We would like the government to ensure that employers institute programs of awareness and education regarding sexual harassment in working establishments; enforce the Human Rights Code of Ontario and the Employment Standards Act with respect to sexual harassment in a timely fashion and with appropriate penalties, and declare sexual harassment a hazard in the Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Support and custody orders: We need to stress the importance that there be co-operation between provinces. It has to be nationwide. It will not work unless it is nationwide. We offer our support to the government for its recent introduction of proposed legislation extending the enforcement of support and custody payments. Further, we would urge the government to amend the act respecting enforcement of support and custody orders to include enforcement orders for court costs and payments pursuant to property transfers. In addition to recipients of the family benefits allowance, we would ask the government to publicize the Support and Custody Orders Enforcement Act to those who do not receive family allowance or have not been in need of it.

Child care is one of our major problems at this point. We need to come to some agreement between the provinces and we need a feeling of unity. Many European countries have great child care facilities that we might pattern ourselves on. We as working women are the major users of this service, and over the years we have continued to voice our concerns on the lack of quality, affordable child care.

We would ask the government to give priority and set adequate goals in the next three-year plan for 1991-93:

To provide funding for the expansion of licensed, quality, affordable child care services to catch up to the level of the need for accessible day care services, especially to

meet the needs of parents who are shift workers, those who are receiving social assistance while attending educational institutions, those who live in rural areas and parents who need care for infants;

To create a controlled, comprehensive day care program funded by the private sector, the user, according to the ability to pay, and the government. We expect a user fee. We would ask the government for incentives for industry to create on-site day care facilities and tax relief to these users for the amount of the day care.

We would ask for stricter government controls on the training and certification of the staff and facilities. We want a uniform set of rules and training set up for these child care centres, where we put our children.

Illiteracy: We recognize that illiteracy is a major problem in our society today. BPWC would urge the government to undertake an advertising program similar to the US program. We see that every day on our TVs about illiteracy in the US, but we see very little in Canada. Where we may do the most benefit is possibly on TV during the 6/49—people love to buy all these tickets—radio campaigns and using school videos; there are a number of illiterate children within our school systems.

Constitutional reform: In considering future amendments to the Canadian Constitution, we would urge the government to put procedures in place to ensure that any change in the Canadian Constitution Act affirm the rights and freedom of women, visible minorities, aboriginal people, persons with disabilities and francophone minorities outside of Quebec, and to ensure these changes are consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canada. We would ask the government to develop a democratic amending process for Constitutional reform, with full prior public debate of all issues under the Constitution and full participation by all those involved, all the women's groups and minorities I listed prior.

To give a full female perspective, BPWC would ask the government for appointments of concerned women to government boards and committees which address issues of major concern to all women. Some of these areas would include:

Free trade: Appoint women to free trade discussions who will present and ensure that the concerns of the business and professional women relating to free trade will be tabled and addressed during important economic decision-making processes.

Judges: While we commend Ontario on its leadership role in the appointment of more women to the bench, we would ask the government to revise the appointment process to increase the total number of women appointed to the bench both at the provincial and federal levels.

Disabled and handicapped persons: The appointment of disabled and physically handicapped adults to government boards or commissions which deal with matters directly affecting the lives of these individuals.

Free trade: We are concerned with probable job losses as the direct result of free trade. We would urge the government to ensure that prospective job loss caused by the arrangements of such labour-intensive industries as clothing, textiles and electrical product manufacturing, which

employ a large portion of females, is countered with ready access to alternative employment opportunities and re-training programs, with opportunities for relocation and adjustment assistance programs fostering adjustment to new working conditions, and by ensuring strict adherence to the 10-year phase-in provision in these industries. We would ask the government to provide some training programs and ensure employment opportunities in the areas of predicted job growth—job relocation and retraining—such as in the service sector, which is predicted to have a large growth.

2040

We commended the government last year for the provision of funding educational programs to train women in non-traditional occupations, including apprenticeships. We have some apprenticeship training going in the city right now. However, we feel that further action is needed in the area of education for non-traditional occupations.

We have made repeated requests to the government: to sponsor campaigns to encourage females in school to choose mathematics and science courses and other occupational paths which have in the past been considered non-traditional for females; to continue to sensitize and train school counsellors and educators on these issues; to make funding available to school boards, colleges and universities to compile statistics and conduct research to identify any barriers which might be discouraging females from continuing to study math and science and choosing non-traditional occupations, and to develop an action plan for removing such barriers.

We would also ask them to co-operate with businesses in retraining programs and upgrading of present employees, and to provide additional financial incentives to employers who are providing on-the-job training for women in non-traditional occupations.

Across the province and Canada, the trend to downsize many of our major businesses and industries has escalated. We are rapidly becoming a nation of specialized, small industries and businesses. In recent years, the number of women entrepreneurs opening small businesses has outnumbered their male counterparts. In light of these revealing facts, BPWC would ask the government to continue to develop and endorse programs which will encourage women to participate in the start-up of small businesses, specifically, financial counselling, marketing strategy information, loans, grants and consultative support; encourage financial institutes to make credit available to women on the same basis as to men to start their businesses; develop adequate social support systems for women, including maternal health care and provision of child care during working hours; develop economic strategies which provide incentive to women to begin their own business ventures.

Bilingualism: We are a national organization, and on the national level we are a bilingual organization. We try to operate on a bilingual basis as much as possible due to the fact that we have clubs in regions of Quebec and New Brunswick where French is the primary language, but over the years we have found this mode of operation prohibitive without the assistance of government funding. We will be able to continue to operate as such only as long as govern-

ment funding is made available. Next May we will be having a provincial conference. We were asked to make it a bilingual conference at our last conference, but unless we can receive full funding we will not be able to hold a bilingual conference in the city.

I thank you for your time. That is it.

Ms Churley: In the interest of allowing my other colleagues to ask you questions, I will be quick. This is very comprehensive, and thank you very much.

I just wanted to know if you talked to your Quebec counterparts during the Meech accord, some of the women who were involved or, should I say, not involved at that time. I know there was a lot of controversy around women being left out. I just would like to know if you have had any communication around that.

Ms Selkirk: Not really. We have very low representation from Quebec when we go to our national conferences. They are an outspoken group and they want to have their representation, but as far as the Meech Lake accord is concerned, there was little discussed because our conference was right when it was dying, right at that time, and very little was said on that issue.

Ms Churley: One other quick question. You mentioned a national conference on violence against women. When is that, or do you have a date yet?

Ms Selkirk: That is just in the planning stage. I heard November as the date, probably in Toronto.

Ms Churley: Perhaps you could let us know. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

BERNADETTE MORIN-STROM

The Chair: I call next Bernadette Morin-Strom.

Ms Morin-Strom: Thank you for the opportunity to speak about a new Canada. Your public discussion paper raises many important questions about where we are headed as a province and as a nation. I certainly am concerned about our economy, fully supportive of the right to native self-government, and want to see real equality for women and minorities. However, I do not have the expertise nor the time today to address these issues.

My objective today is solely to give you some insight as a Franco-Ontarian living in Sault Ste Marie. I believe our experience must be heeded when addressing your discussion-paper question: What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?

Je suis ici aujourd'hui pour vous parler du Canada, de l'Ontario et de Sault-Sainte-Marie. Sault-Sainte-Marie est ma ville natale, ma mère est née ici, et mon père est venu ici du Québec il y a 50 ans. J'étais fière de ma ville, de ma province et de mons pays. Je me sentais chez moi ici, je me sentais appréciée et valorisée. Il y avait toujours des gens qui souffraient de la francophobie, mais ces gens devenaient vraiment une minorité. Les écoles d'immersion débordaient, et il me semblait que ma génération avait enfin reconnu la dualité du Canada. J'étais à l'aise dans ma ville, dans ma province et dans mons pays.

Le 29 janvier 1990 tout cela a changé. En se déclarant unilingue anglaise, ma ville natale rejetait la vision de la

dualité du Canada et offrait à sa place une vision unilingue. Cette ancienne vision du Canada sous le masque de multiculturalisme est une vision d'assimilation qui voit notre pays comme la société américaine, une sorte de "melting pot", une vision où ma province deviendrait, à mon avis, l'état de l'Ontario aux Etats-Unis.

Il faut absolument démasquer cette résolution qui en fait était le résultat d'une pétition préparée par l'Association pour la préservation de la langue anglaise, un groupe qui a comme but la destruction du français dans notre pays. Aujourd'hui, la population qui a une héritage français à Sault-Sainte-Marie est à 9 % mais seulement 4 % peuvent encore parler la langue française. Même parmi ceux qui peuvent parler le français, 89 % n'utilisent pas le français dans leur vie quotidienne. L'assimilation est presque complet ici, une situation très, très différent des autres communautés comme Sudbury, Timmins et North Bay.

Nous sommes une minorité menacée qui poursuivait nos droits linguistiques quand nous avons été visés par le Conseil de ville. Nous avons souffert une insulte, enfin toute la francophonie du Canada a subi cette insulte qui n'était pas digne de cette ville. L'affronter à la nature même du Canada demeure encore ici, une année plus tard, comme symbole de l'intolérance et de l'ignorance.

Ce que le mouvement anti-français voulait, c'était d'envoyer un message d'intolérance au Québec afin qu'il se sépare. Beaucoup de gens de Sault-Sainte-Marie ont été dupés et maintenant dans l'histoire du Canada nous serons renommés, pas à cause de notre générosité, mais à cause de notre intolérance envers un peuple qui fait partie de notre famille canadienne.

I hope your committee will recognize the bitter experiences of Franco-Ontarians here in the Sault since our community declared itself English only, one year ago. I believe our experiences are an indication of what more than a half-million Franco-Ontarians will face across Ontario if Quebec leaves Canada and Ontario becomes part of a new English-speaking country.

In my opinion, Sault Ste Marie has given political legitimacy to the vilest forms of cultural and linguistic repressions at the street level. Francophones are harassed for speaking French in restaurants, while shopping, or at work, with comments like: "We speak white only here. Don't you know it's an English community?" Bigotry continues to be displayed daily on the radio phone-in talk programs and francophones have become the scapegoats for all of society's ills. If there are not enough beds in the hospital, it is because we have bilingualism. If the streets are not shovelled, it is because we have bilingualism. Everything is related back to bilingualism.

2050

As a teacher, I know that more and more children are being told that French classes do not matter. Despite Bill 8's applicability to our district, government agencies appear to be intimidated away from posting positions requiring French fluency in Sault Ste Marie.

There has been a decline, not an enhancement, of French-language services in our area. A number of unqualified teachers have had to be hired this year because qualified

francophones will not move here. The français program has degenerated from the program I was in 30 years ago into what is effectively a French immersion program culturally inappropriate to meeting the needs of Franco-Ontarians. The will to maintain a Franco-Ontarian culture is dying in Sault Ste Marie, as surely as it will die across Ontario if our province becomes part of a new English-only country.

The reaction of francophones to their repression in the Sault has manifested itself in a number of ways. There has been political mobilization of hundreds of ordinary folk to attend rallies, write letters and march monthly on city hall. While the support of many anglophones has been noteworthy, the lack of response from most business, labour and community leaders after more than a year of fighting has left many francophones with the feeling that Sault Ste Marie is no longer their home.

As a result, many francophones are withdrawing from broader community involvement. Even in these desperate economic times with difficulties at Algoma Steel and with numerous small businesses closing, many francophones have resorted to personal boycotts of Sault Ste Marie, spending their consumer dollar whenever possible in Sault, Michigan, or elsewhere in Ontario.

Most difficult of all is to be forced to choose between your language and culture and your home town. A decision to move one's home, to uplift your family and start over again elsewhere is never an easy one to be taken lightly. I know that in the teaching profession alone, more than a dozen families have already decided to leave the Sault. A consensus is developing that the French language and a local French culture that goes back 350 years is now doomed in Sault Ste Marie. Perhaps the city's name will be changed to St Mary's Falls.

The French language and our French culture are not relics in Canada. They will be fought for and maintained in Quebec, if nowhere else. I sincerely hope that Franco-Ontarians will demonstrate the same will to survive. The experience of francophones here in the Sault has helped me understand some of what Quebecers feel when they are talked down to by Canada's English-speaking majority. Today I sympathize with and support the aspirations of Quebecers to a degree I never had previously. This does not necessarily mean that I agree with separatism, but I do understand what it is like to be constantly hit with these analogies of French Canadians being compared to the AIDS virus or when cities in Ontario start saying that they want to be unilingual and they do not want the French factor here.

I think that what happened in Sault Ste Marie or across Canada and especially in Quebec, the reaction they had to Sault Ste Marie being a French community with a French name—they always knew that Alberta and the west never really understood them, but they never thought that their neighbour Ontario did not understand them either. When we began declaring ourselves unilingual, I think Quebecers said: "Who in Canada wants us? Who values us? Who appreciates us?" When people stand back and say, "Quebec is going to separate," who has pushed Quebec

away? I think that is a central issue that has not been dealt with.

L'Ontario doit garantir les droits linguistiques et culturelles aux Franco-Ontariens, autrement, dans un nouveau pays anglophone, plus de la moitié de un million de Franco-Ontariens auront à choisir entre leur ville et leur héritage français, un choix déjà subi par beaucoup de franco-ontariens du Sault.

As a first step in good faith, Ontario should follow the lead of New Brunswick and immediately move to declare Ontario officially bilingual. This action, while largely symbolic in nature today, would clearly indicate the resolve of Ontario to maintain the French language and culture as a fundamental element of our province now and in the future.

In conclusion, I would like to quote and fully support Premier Bob Rae's concluding speech from the debate on Bill 8:

"It is our view and it is my personal view that Ontario can do an immense amount for national unity by taking that next step beyond the step we have taken today, a step that would include and recognize French as an official language in this province and one that would guarantee those rights in the Constitution."

And Bob Rae went on to say:

«Ça va prendre encore un peu d'effort de la part de tous ceux parmi nous qui pensent qu'il est vraiment temps d'enchaîner ces droits dans la Constitution». Fin de la citation.

Monsieur le Président, je vous remercie de votre patience.

M. le Président : Je crois que je parle au nom du comité en vous remerciant pour être venue ici et pour nous parler de l'expérience que vous avez vécue à Sault-Ste-Marie. I think that—I hope at least and I think on this I speak for the members of the committee—our presence in this council chamber as a legislative committee functioning fully in English and French is an indication of our support for the kinds of directions that we need to move in here and across the province.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Ms Karl Morin-Strom, thank you so much and thank you for delivering in both French and English. I really do see that there is suffering in your brief. I think it is more than generous that you would share that with us, that you would tell us what you really know is happening here. The depth of it I did not appreciate until you spoke.

There is one section I would like to ask you about. Because of my limitations, I would like to ask you what you mean by the French education—I presume you are speaking about francophone students—is like French immersion now. Could you say a little bit more about that and why that is like that?

Ms Morin-Strom: I am a French immersion teacher, so what I do is I teach children who are basically from anglophone backgrounds. A francophone school does not operate that way. A francophone school would operate in the sense that the children coming to you in kindergarten already have a fluency in the language.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am pretty familiar with this in that I was helpful in the Bill 109 stuff, but could you tell me why there must be that kind of environment here?

Ms Morin-Strom: What is happening in the school board—the public school board I know more about because I teach in the public school board—but what I am thinking about is that they have lost many French first-language teachers in the separate school board, and what is happening now is that the classes are being taught by teachers who are not qualified as French teachers, who perhaps are fluent in the language but who are not qualified, or the other way around, qualified but not fluent in the language.

I am not sure what the status is now, but because the French first-language schools have lost so many children, the enrolment is declining and declining to the point where I guess everything will come true. People will turn around and say, "We can't have a school because there are only two children here or 10 children," where at one time there were 50, but they are all leaving because the quality of education that they need is just not here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I hope that will not happen.

Ms Morin-Strom: I hope so too, but I do not know.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for your very, very passionate plea.

Mr Beer: I just have a very brief comment. May I, as the former minister responsible for francophone affairs and particularly here in this place, thank you and so many of the people in Sault Ste Marie who tried to find a way through the crisis that emerged last year. I know that there were many, many dedicated people who really do see a city in which francophone and anglophone can live happily together. As you know, a number of us here around the table served with your husband, Karl, and I hope you will take our best wishes to him for his courage in the positions that he has taken. We wish you both the very best in the future.

LOUISE CAMPBELL

The Chair: I call next Louise Campbell.

Ms Campbell: Mr Chairman and committee members, thank you for listening to me this evening. Madame Morin-Strom and I teach at the same school, we are both immersion teachers, and we gave each other moral support. She said, "You speak 15 minutes and I'll speak 15 minutes," so I am here too. I am glad I came. I am impressed with the quality of the presentations that I have seen on behalf of Sault Ste Marie this evening and I am also impressed with your involvement. I have a very deep sense that you are not hobby politicians.

The whole idea of looking at a new Canada and the role that Ontario will play in it leaves me personally disheartened. To me, Ontario has always been a province on the leading edge of trends in the country and in the world. The linguistic, economic and social tensions we live with now are symptomatic of either some form of adolescent crisis or a true parting of the ways in this country, and for this I am deeply sorry. The issues are many and very complex and even though I hardly feel qualified to voice my

vision, I feel the need to express my deep sense of discouragement and betrayal.

2100

I have always lived in Ontario but not always in the north. Educationally I am a product of the bilingual school system, a school system that before the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism and the Official Languages Act, provided a second-class educational opportunity for French-speaking citizens, especially those in the north.

My language has always been important to me. My maternal grandmother encouraged, cajoled and begged that we maintain this, one of our gifts of birth. My paternal grandmother told us stories of her postmaster father making every effort to render service in French to the people he served and in so doing becoming bilingual, and the generation that followed him continued in that trend. My language made me different and I learned to live with the difference and be proud of the difference. I am not unaccustomed to negative attitudes. I have worked through, over, under and around them all of my professional career.

I believe my spirit to overcome was undergirded by a belief that my province and my country were following the high road on this issue as well as many other issues. Today that faith has been shaken. My trust in a system that will openly and fairly listen to the grievances of its constituents does not exist. I have spent a year reeling from the betrayal that has been perpetrated on a minority group. What makes it even sadder is that it was aimed at a minority within the minority.

Hatred and mistrust are not as accurate as smart weapons. They destroy more than their target. The fear and misinformation that has been spread around has fired a populace that was frustrated and confused about more than just the language issue in this country. It has always been my experience that if you want to detract from the real concerns, throw out the French-English red herring, sit back and watch them fight. We have many freedoms in this country and, as far as circulating a petition and whipping up a frenzy of francophobia is concerned, that is also within the realm of individual rights.

Requesting a cultural centre and better education for francophone citizens within this community is also the right of groups and individuals. These exercises are, in my opinion, healthy. They produce stress but they also generate growth. Just as this is, good discussion is difficult but it is important and it is needed. If the old Canada has to fall away, so be it but the new Canada must protect its greatest asset, and that is its people. No one should ever wake up to a government that uses them to send a message to another level of government, as we were used in Sault Ste Marie.

People danced for joy in their kitchens for the victory that they had won. Cheers of, "We've got them now" were heard at victory meetings. The pain I felt was ignored by people who, given a death in my family or a serious illness, would have at least offered a kind word. I have been told, "Give it up, ignore it." Yet every day I pour out to hungry young minds the essence of me that makes me so special in my French immersion class.

I have never lived in Quebec and I feel like an abandoned child in a custody nightmare. I am told, "Go back to where you came from," but I have always lived here. "Stop ramming French down our throats." But you know, ladies and gentlemen, I have been humbled by the efforts I have seen as I have taught adults and children who have made the greatest effort to try to learn a second language and bridge the gaps that lie between us. "Get on with the future," but if I ignore my past, I have no future. "Bilingualism costs too much. It is an impossible goal." But when I was born, no one would have believed we would some day walk on the moon.

I have never accepted and I cannot accept this attitude. If there is to be a new Canada, then I hope that it will cherish, protect and encourage one of its rights of birth that makes it so special and that is its francophone entity.

The Chair: There are a few questions and I would like to ask the members, again, to be very, very brief, because we are running beyond the time and we still have a few people we want to try to hear from.

Ms Harrington: I would just like to say that I believe those of us on the committee who have been here tonight and for the last four days are humbled by what we have heard of your struggle in this city. I just want to say that what we have learned, I believe, is how fragile a thing language is, through the native culture that we have interacted with in the last few days and of course the French language.

I thank you for your courage for coming and I also think that the very second presenter in Kenora on Monday said that the French language and culture are part of the very fabric of Canada. I think that is what we are hearing again.

Ms Campbell: It distinguishes us from the United States. Otherwise we are just another state.

Mr Offer: By way of comment, I note that you started your presentation by indicating a deep sense of discouragement and a faith that is shaken and you ended it by almost a hope that a new Canada, whatever that be, is characterized by one that is tolerant and cherishes so many of those values that we have heard so far today and in the previous days and, I trust, in the future.

I can only say, certainly on my behalf and I am sure on behalf of all the members of the committee, thank you for coming and sharing with us, first, that which is so important to you, that which causes such despair, and ending on a note that is one of optimism, not without challenge. Hopefully this committee in its endeavours will find values such as you have spoken of today, which are values not of difference, but rather of unity and of sameness, and for that maybe we will all be better off.

Mr Bisson: Just a very short question: One of the things I think we sense from the committee, and I think people who are watching, is a deep sense of hurt. I think that hurt is shared among a number of people, not only the francophone community but other people as well, because I believe that the view purported sometimes is not the majority view. But sometimes what happens is that adversity brings out the best in people and gives us the will, allows

us to appreciate sometimes what we can possibly lose or where we are going.

I guess what I am asking is, do you think that there is enough goodwill out there to go ahead and to really honestly look at some of the questions that trouble us on language, economics and all of that?

Ms Campbell: Yes, I believe there is. I really believe there is even in this community. As far as I am concerned, Sault Ste Marie did not deserve this kind of a reputation.

Mr Bisson: I agree.

Ms Campbell: We are a wonderful city.

Mr Bisson: I agree.

Ms Campbell: We have a picture of Terry Fox here and I was in the Sault when Terry Fox came and followed him, because my husband at that time was a broadcaster and the whole city came out to welcome Terry Fox. That is Sault Ste Marie. We are a generous and beautiful community and we do not deserve this. We have been threatened by our local government that if we do not stop our demonstrations, it will be put to a referendum. If that is the only way this black mark can be taken away from our community, I say, "Well then, so be it." That discourages me and disheartens me, because I think this community deserves more than to have a municipal election run on this issue. We are facing some tremendous issues in Sault Ste Marie—

2110

Mr Bisson: There needs to be a lot of dialogue on this issue before it can come to a referendum.

Ms Campbell: Oh, absolutely. The francophobia is true. When you have people who constantly say, "Well, I have nothing against you people," it gives me the shivers and little red flags pop up all over the place. I am not a fool. I am not a dreamer. I do not believe for a minute that all the parents who have their children in immersion programs are there because they want—they are trying to give their children an advantage in life and if that is what we give them, then fine.

But then I also pick up Newsweek magazine, which is an American publication, and I see how the United States is struggling now to catch up with us as far as second languages are concerned. They realize that if they are going to be fit for the year 2000, they have to put some effort into second-language programs, and here we are saying, "Stop that." We are ahead of them and yet we are taking steps backwards. And why? Because of fear.

I am not any different than you are. As a matter of fact there is one good thing that has come out of this for me and that is, finally, a deep understanding of what assimilation is. I am assimilated. The French community sends me correspondence in English and the English community corresponds to me in French, because nobody knows what I am. But I know what assimilation is now. I know what it is. I did not before. So there has been some good from that perspective.

LORRAINE MARTTINEN

The Chair: I call next Lorraine Marttinen.

Ms Marttinen: Hi. I am the president of the deaf club here in the Sault. Unfortunately we closed that club three years ago, because we could not get adequate membership.

Hearing people, I feel, should know more about deaf people. They should be able to break into the deaf world, but because hearing people have fears and inhibitions, they are afraid to talk to us. They are afraid that maybe they will do something that we will perceive as making fun of us, or that they will offend us, so they do not approach us.

We also need them to understand our needs because many hearing people take sign language classes at the colleges, but they never socialize with us, never talk to us. I do not know if they have taken the courses just for fun, but they never get out and find out what we are really like. Why bother learning sign language if you do not speak to us? Why do you not come out and see us? You are always welcome to approach us at any time. Any events we have, you are welcome to join. We would encourage hearing membership in anything that we do.

I feel the issue of interpreting is extremely important. I asked for an interpreter at a union meeting and was refused that because there is none in the city and they would have had to bring somebody in, and they said the cost was too much. They would have to fly them into the Sault, put them up in a hotel and pay for meals. So, sorry, I could not get one. I think the Sault needs interpreters. We have to have that kind of access. It is tremendously frustrating for me. They say, oh, they will try to find some woman who will type out what is going on and I can try to read the English on a TV monitor. That is not the same.

The regular news on our local station, on channel 11, does not have captioning. Many of the programs have captioning and I think that is great, and then as soon as the local TV news comes on, the captioning disappears and I have no idea what is going on in my own city.

We have sent petitions down to Toronto and have heard nothing back from them. We want to see our own local news have captions and also programs such as Crimestoppers. I feel embarrassed sometimes. I found out that somebody had actually broken in nearby and I would not even know anything about it. I might have seen something, but I cannot even access those programs. We buy TV sets and they do not have captioning in them. We have to have additional outlay of cash to buy that. The new Maclean company that is here in the Sault now I certainly hope will recognize our needs, recognize the problem and help us out in this issue.

Ms Churley: You are the first deaf woman who has spoken to us and although I have nothing against deaf men, of course—I have a very good friend sitting here and we are very proud to have Gary with us, because he has certainly brought an awareness to not just the NDP but the whole Legislature, and some of us are even learning a little sign language.

I just wanted to ask you, because I always ask these kinds of questions, if in the deaf community there are particular problems that affect you in a different way from

men, being a deaf woman, and if there are special needs you have as a deaf woman?

Ms Marttinen: No, I do not think I really have any special problems just because of that. I would not say so.

Ms Churley: Okay. One last thing: I think that the next thing as we are moving to get more women into politics is that perhaps some day we would like to see a deaf woman in politics as well. I thank you for presenting. Maybe it will be you.

Ms Marttinen: Who, me? I do not know. I do not think so. I am a little too nervous for that, but thank you.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We are all getting tired, but I think if Ms Churley goes back, we did have a deaf woman last night—a native deaf woman, a single parent, if you remember.

Ms Churley: You are quite correct. Thank you for reminding me of that. We are tired. You are the second deaf woman who has presented.

The Chair: But the first in Sault Ste Marie. Thank you very much.

Ms Marttinen: I hope that I do have this dream now.

The Chair: The time is drawing beyond the possible. We have three other people who had added their names to the list. I know one of them, at least I gather, gave us a brief. What I would like to do is give those three individuals an opportunity to have up to four or five minutes each, if that will suffice, because we are under strict times with our plane out of here, and I apologize for that but we do not have much choice about that, and we will certainly be happy to take any additional comments in writing that people may want to send us after that. I think that is the best we can do, quite frankly, and with that in mind I then offer the opportunity to Phillip Turmain to come forward if he wishes to.

PHILLIP TURMAIN

Mr Turmain: Sorry to hold you up. I did not expect to get to read.

It seems logical to state that today's society, and all the problems which plague it, are the products of our historical developments, and since we must begin somewhere to make timely relationships we will use 1867, our year of Confederation.

As a country we commenced back then to establish laws. They were written as they were needed. Let us make the very generous allowance here that all of the laws that were written were of at least some value. In any case, the individual effects of those laws, compounded by the factor of their interrelational effects, means that what we have today is a thick legal soup. It has become so laden with improvements to our social fabric that it can barely be stirred and is almost without taste.

Every debate exists today because one or more historical events is a constituent part of the soup. The only way a problem can be properly analysed and possibly solved is to consider its age and the according complexity that time has wrought. For every deficiency that our former legislators allowed, there is another dimension to the problem as it exists now, and I am here to say that nobody ever learned how to dismantle soup. Let us just forget that method.

What is all this analogy designed to say, you might ask. Let us examine a couple of examples here. Free trade: To the critics who would kill this legislation, consider this: It took 123 years to create the morass of trading restrictions, penalties, subsidies and other complications and to screw things up so badly. At least give credit to the Conservatives for having the courage to bear the sins of all previous governments in their valiant attempt to repair the past and to step into the new world markets which are exploding all about us. Just as Rome was not built in one day, neither could it be torn down in one day.

English-French: Hot potatoes do not break when they are dropped. This is a hot light bulb, an idea which is delicate but sound and certainly deserving. However the legislation reads, it guaranteed from the beginning that we are a bicultural society and that French rights are equal to English rights. Now all of a sudden, 123 years later, we are being told that today's working society is going to be forced to bear the entire financial burden of fixing our past neglect now.

Hold it, please. I am of French Canadian descent and I am proud of my heritage, but let's be reasonable. Allow us at least a generation of slow implementation. The cost belongs to many, most of whom are deceased. Do not dump all of it on today's society; it just is not fair.

2120

The proponents of Meech Lake and the critics of the Sault Ste Marie city council decision to declare Sault Ste Marie officially English should have the broad shoulders to admit that there is a huge difference between racism and what actually prompted the Sault council's decision. Remember, *je suis français, je parle français comme un résident de Québec. Je ne sais pas tous les mots et les phrases.*

I am a French Canadian. Practical is practical and needless expense is exactly that, especially when it falls on us, the people of today. Let us plan and work towards a future target date, for example 2025 when these things have been paid for over time, just as they became a problem over time.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. I do not know what happened to the lights. Maybe someone is trying to tell us something.

ALBERT KANGAS

The Chair: The second person I would like to call is Albert Kangas.

Mr Kangas: I would like to say thank you for allowing us people to say a few words.

Dear Canada, both of my parents were immigrants from Europe. I am a Canadian first. This is what this country is all about. I believe in one captain on a ship and that is a strong federal system.

Our school system should encourage a strong Canada, not what appears to be a system that is afraid of nationalism, of pride in our country. This is what holds a nation together in times of crisis. Other countries ask, "What is a Canadian?" It is about time we became Canadians or used our free trade policy to become Americans.

We seem to promote multiculturalism. That, I believe, is just a smokescreen to promote bilingualism. This type of

approach is what is dividing the country. If any group of people wishes to promote its own cultural programs, it does so on its own. This should not be funded by any government. We are a unilingual country that at no time could afford these financial burdens.

The only reason we have bilingualism is to keep Quebec in Confederation. The financial cost is too high and there is no rate of return on this investment. I am not promoting English-only in Quebec. I am stating that the rest of Canada cannot afford the inefficiencies of a bilingual system. With the state of the world economies and tough business competition in the years ahead, we have to have accountability of all governments.

Canadians cannot necessarily afford programs that the governments say are good for us. We, as a nation, are educated and are able to think for ourselves what we can afford or not. Since the taxpayers of this country have no say in how our money is spent, we need referenda to voice our wishes. It is obvious that we cannot speak through our MPs since they have to vote on party lines.

In this new world order that all nations are talking about, I believe we can have a united Canada if people show forgiveness, love and think of a country, Canada, as a whole, not just their little corner of the world.

LOUISE PRIMEAU

The Chair: I call next and last Louise Primeau.

Ms Primeau: Thank you. I realize I am last so I will speak as quickly as I can, but as effectively as I can. I also had notice from the labour council on Tuesday night and I had chosen not to speak, but as I sat in the audience, I was somewhat excited about the topic this evening and the quality of the speakers.

What I would like to do is tell you a little bit about why I am coming forward. I am a parent. I am a grandparent. I am a social worker and an activist, and it is not on any one front but on all fronts that I would like to speak to you about some of my concerns. The list I have is so extensive and I realize how exhausted you are. Some speakers have made some reference to it, but I would like to add my name to those concerns.

I am ultimately concerned about the state of the economy that we are in locally, provincially and on a national level. I am concerned about the recession and the high unemployment, particularly in Sault Ste Marie, and the devastation that is causing to our community and to our families. I am ultimately concerned about where our funding is going, where our money is being prioritized to.

I would like to touch a little bit on the war in the Persian Gulf and I want to say that on 15 January of this year I was immobilized and paralysed as I could not escape the devastation of the news on the media about what was happening. I am troubled that Canada is a party to the war. I am saddened by the fact that our troops are over there. That is not to say that I do not take the position that we support the troops, but I really do feel very strongly that we should support the troops and bring them home.

I feel that Canada has always been a peaceful nation, has always tried to resolve matters in a very equitable way. I believe that the measures we took were not long-term

enough and that this has repercussions throughout the land. I cannot understand how we can discuss finding funding for a war when we are in such a position that we are talking about cutbacks on all levels of government—municipal, provincial and federal.

I feel that our main concern has to be the people in our land. I feel it is very regretful that it is oil that has brought this issue to bear. I do not believe—I wish someone could convince me otherwise—that our real concerns are the people over there. I wish that was the case. I wish we could say that we cared about freedom for all, but quite frankly I am convinced that what has motivated us is a product that we want to control in our economy, and as such we have got involved in a war that I am not sure will be resolved in any way that is going to be helpful to anyone. I wish Canada—through my MPP and MP—would send that message to our governments.

I would just like to touch bases and tell you that I feel there is somewhat of a paradox in terms of aboriginal rights in Canada. I feel very strongly that the government ought to resolve this quickly, effectively and equitably. I feel very betrayed, in a sense, that Canada feels that we have got to go to the rescue of another nation because of invasion, particularly one that we feel is land-related, and we are not able to settle this matter effectively and quickly in Canada. I would like to encourage us to get involved and do so.

Free trade: I am ultimately concerned about free trade. I am concerned about the extensive loss of jobs, and again, I cannot even begin to say, on all levels.

I am concerned about the language issue in Sault Ste Marie. I would like to reiterate what the previous speakers have said. I also feel very strongly that what has happened in Sault Ste Marie was very unnecessary and very painful for many people, and I would like to see at some point that we can come to terms with that and somewhere, in some way resolve the matter so that we can get on with some other issues. That does not mean to say that we just ignore it and sweep it under the carpet. It is a very big issue.

I would like to talk a little bit about the GST and the unrest about that. The average Canadian, I guess in all corners of our nation, is ultimately concerned about taxation and the excessiveness of it.

I would just like to add deregulation to my list of my concerns. Ultimately I am concerned about deregulation. Every time I step on an aircraft I do not know if I am coming home. I have never to date had one uneventful incident in terms of a flight in or out of Sault Ste Marie, as recently as Monday. As recently as last Friday, when I got on an aircraft in British Columbia and we were streaming down the runway at maximum speed, zap, the aircraft stopped. I thought, "Well, gee, I thought they would have been a little alerted to the fact that we would have had our runway," but it was another mechanical failure. Deregulation is at the top of my list.

Privatization: I really would like the government to get back involved in terms of ownership. Needless to say, I am concerned about some of the systems in the province. I am concerned about our educational system. My children attend French education in Sault Ste Marie. I am concerned

because I have two special needs children. Language is at the forefront of my concerns, but second to that not only is the language an issue, but the resources in that system is an issue. They cannot accommodate the needs of my children and that is something I wish I will have an opportunity to bring forward in future.

I leave you with that. I have talked as fast as I can. That is not my exhaustive list. I am glad I am the last speaker and I thank you for listening.

Ms Harrington: I just want to quickly comment that from the excellent speakers we have heard tonight, I would encourage all of you, especially the women, to run for city council this year.

The Chair: That comes from a former city councillor.

Ms Primeau: That is the plan.

The Chair: Just in closing I thank all of you who came here this evening to make presentations and those who came earlier today. We obviously heard a number of very useful comments to us. Particularly overarching all of those, I think, was a challenge to all of us to find new solutions both as politicians, but also as members of the public and the population of Ontario. It is our intent to continue that process to the best of our ability, both within our committee and also to find ways to continue the discussion with people across the province.

Our hearings continue next week, starting on Monday in Timmins and proceeding to Sudbury, North Bay and Orillia and Collingwood. You can follow our proceedings through the parliamentary channel if you are interested. Good evening.

The committee adjourned at 2132.

CONTENTS

Thursday 7 February 1991

Joe Fratesi	C-187
CALM	C-188
Ted Hallin	C-190
Lila Leach	C-192
Bob Palanuk	C-193
John Weglo	C-193
Ecoles séparées catholiques du district de Sault-Sainte-Marie	C-195
Porte-ouverte	C-197
Sault Ste Marie Indian Friendship Centre	C-200
Alliance Sault-Canada	C-203
United Steelworkers of America	C-205
Centre francophone de Sault-Sainte-Marie	C-206
Evening sitting	C-209
Jerry Frost	C-209
Jim Hilsinger	C-210
Ron Yurick	C-211
Gail Broad	C-212
Charles Swift	C-213
Sault Ste Marie and District Labour Council	C-216
Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Ontario	C-219
Bernadette Morin-Strom	C-221
Louise Campbell	C-223
Lorraine Marttinen	C-225
Phillip Turmain	C-226
Albert Kangas	C-226
Louise Primeau	C-227
Adjournment	C-228

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)
Vice-Chair: Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)
 Beer, Charles (York North L)
 Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)
 Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)
 Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)
 Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)
 Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)
 Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)
 O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)
 Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)
 Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Also taking part: Martin, Tony (Sault Ste Marie NDP)

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis

Staff:

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office
 Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Hansard Reporting Service, 481 Legislative Building, Toronto Ontario, M7A 1A2 Phone: (416) 965-1456 Fax: (416) 963-1387

CAZON
XC2
-1990
052



C-8 1991

C-8 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 11 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 11 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Monday 11 February 1991

The committee met at 1314 in the Timmins High and Vocational School, Timmins.

The Chair: I would like to call this meeting to order, please. My name is Tony Silipo. I am the Chair of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I want to welcome all of you who are here this afternoon in Timmins and point out to those who are following our proceedings through the parliamentary channel that we are, of course, resuming our hearings on Ontario in Confederation from Timmins today. This is the beginning of the second week of our hearings throughout the province which saw us last week in the communities of Kenora, Dryden, Sioux Lookout, Thunder Bay and Sault Ste Marie.

I will simply begin by introducing the members of the committee who are here with us. This is an all-party committee made up of representatives of the three parties represented in the Legislature of Ontario. From the NDP caucus we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, who is the Vice-Chair of the committee, David Winninger, Fred Wilson, Marilyn Churley and Tony Martin. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick, and also joining us today is the member for Timiskaming, David Ramsay.

We have a full list of people to speak to us this afternoon and this evening and we are still adding some names to the list as we get additions. We will try to do our best to accommodate those people whose names we did not have before. I would like to point out, if there are people in the audience who are interested in speaking to us and who are not sure whether their names are on the list or who would like to get added to the list if we have time, there is a table up at the back of the hall. If you would let people know up there, we will try our best to add you to the list.

With that in mind, I would ask the people who are speaking to us if you could keep your comments to within 20 minutes if you are presenting on behalf of a group and 10 minutes if you are presenting on behalf of yourself. Then that will give us an opportunity to try to get through as many people as possible. We will be prepped to go a little bit beyond the time this afternoon, if need be, but we would like to try to stay as close to the time lines as possible.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO/ALPHA

M. le Président : Je voudrais simplement dire que nous sommes contents d'être ici à Timmins aujourd'hui pour la continuation de nos audiences sur l'Ontario dans la Confédération. On va maintenant commencer avec Marius Gauthier et les autres participants qui font partie du groupe de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario/Alpha.

Please come forward, Mr Gauthier. I would just like to say that we are going to give people the option of speaking to us either from the microphones that we have set up out in the stands in the audience, or if you would prefer to come and sit at the table here with us, feel free to do that as well. We will just leave that option up to each group as we go through.

M. Gauthier : Au nom du groupe Alpha, je remercie le comité et ses membres d'avoir pris la peine et le temps de se déplacer. J'apprécie aussi le fait que je pourrai vous faire valoir nos représentations et nos doléances.

Je suis résident de la province de l'Ontario depuis un peu plus de trois ans. J'y ai œuvré dans le domaine de l'éducation et dans le domaine juridique. Depuis ce temps je suis agent de développement de l'ACFO, section de Cochrane-Iroquois Falls. J'agis aussi à titre de coordonnateur Alpha où il s'agit d'alphabetisation aux francophones adultes selon une méthode populaire et communautaire. Je n'ai pas éprouvé de difficultés à m'adapter, vu mon expérience et mes connaissances, mais ce qui me dépayse c'est l'omniprésence du fait anglais, notamment au niveau interne de l'administration gouvernementale. Avant d'appeler au téléphone, il faut quasiment répéter la conversation à venir en cas d'avoir à tenir une conversation d'affaires avec une personne anglophone.

L'acheminement du Canada arrive à une croisée de chemins très importante pour l'ensemble de la population canadienne. L'échec du lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, la crise d'Oka, le traitement réservé aux autochtones, l'aliénation de l'Ouest, le mouvement souverainiste au Québec, l'émergence d'un parti nationaliste québécois à Ottawa ont tendance à remettre fortement en question l'existence même du Canada. Or, l'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle prépondérant dans le rapprochement des différentes régions au pays.

Basée sur sa puissance économique et sa forte attraction industrielle, l'Ontario se voit moins contrainte de formuler des demandes fondamentales de changements et peut en conséquence jouer un rôle de médiateur.

Dans le rapprochement des différentes communautés, à cause de la présence du demi-million de francophones, de nombreux groupes multiculturels, d'une présence importante des communautés autochtones, l'Ontario est donc très bien placée pour signaler l'importance de maintenir des liens étroits, harmonieux et positifs parmi les différents membres de sa communauté. Nous reconnaissons les efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario et notre communauté ont investis, afin que les francophones se sentent partie prenante et participent à fond au développement de l'Ontario.

Je m'occupe depuis trois ans d'alphabetisation communautaire auprès des adultes francophones. Ce travail, tant pour les personnes formatrices que pour les personnes

apprenantes, constitue un véritable défi de part et d'autre. Ces adultes ont dû décrocher du système scolaire d'alors d'une part à cause de problèmes sociaux-économiques ; d'autres ont décroché parce qu'ils ne se retrouvaient pas dans le système scolaire. Or, toutes ces personnes, pendant plus de vingt à trente ans, ont essayé de survivre dans un monde conçu pour les personnes lettrées et alphabétisées.

1320

Cette situation dans une large mesure pourrait s'avérer un moindre mal s'il ne s'agissait pas du manque de volonté pratique et politique provinciale au niveau du bilinguisme. En effet, l'on met tout en oeuvre pour leur faire apprendre la lecture, l'écriture et le calcul dans leur langue maternelle, c'est-à-dire en français, mais quand ces personnes apprenantes se voient confrontées à la réalité, elles se heurtent à un monde anglophone, réalité qui les empêche de s'épanouir, de donner le meilleur d'elles-mêmes. Vu que ces gens sont des citoyens à part entière, il faudrait que l'Ontario se déclare officiellement bilingue, qu'elle s'affiche et s'affirme comme telle sans réserve ni clause «nonobstant».

En réponse au document de consultation, nous ajoutons les commentaires suivants vis-à-vis du Québec. Le Québec est reconnu comme étant, dans les faits, une société distincte. L'Ontario n'est perdante en aucune façon que ce fait soit reconnu et que certains pouvoirs distincts soient rapatriés au Québec.

Vis-à-vis des autochtones, les communautés autochtones constituent des sociétés distinctes et devraient jouir d'un degré d'autonomie leur permettant de gérer leur présent et de déterminer leur avenir.

En ce moment critique de l'histoire de notre pays, les personnes ontariennes et leur gouvernement doivent assumer et jouer un rôle de leadership dans l'évolution de ce pays.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Gauthier. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Monsieur Beer.

M. Beer : Merci pour la présentation que vous venez de nous faire. Je me demande si vous pourriez nous parler un peu de l'impact de la mise en vigueur de la Loi 8 dans cette région. Quels sont les aspects, peut-être toujours faibles, mais quels sont les aspects positifs jusqu'ici avec ce programme ?

M. Gauthier : Merci de votre question. Dans notre région Chatham-Iroquois Falls, nous nous prévalons des dispositions de la Loi 8. Puis, nous avons un bon retour de l'Office des affaires francophones et aussi, les ministères s'y plient aux décisions de l'Office des affaires francophones.

Il y a un point, cependant, que je pense devrait être changé ; c'est concernant la langue interne de l'administration, je remarque, de l'Ontario. La Loi 8 ne s'applique pas à la langue interne, qui est l'anglais. Il est considéré que les documents émanant de l'administration à ses fonctionnaires, à ses employés, que c'est légal que ce soit en anglais. Je pense que ça ne devrait pas exister. Il y a une invitation que je peux faire aux gens, c'est de se servir de la Loi 8 davantage, parce que si on regarde les statistiques concernant le nombre de doléances présentées, c'est encore faible. Mais c'est une excellente loi.

Mr F. Wilson : You have to pardon me, Mr Gauthier. I have a bit of a throat problem today. Two questions actually: Could you tell me the percentage of adult francophones who are considered functionally illiterate that you deal with?

Mr Gauthier : In our place?

Mr F. Wilson : Yes.

Mr Gauthier : About 40%.

Mr F. Wilson : Is that province-wide?

Mr Gauthier : No. It is our area here.

Mr F. Wilson : You mentioned that you thought Ontario should go fully bilingual. Do you not see any other way short of official bilingualism for Ontario? You mentioned that Bill 8 was a very good piece of legislation.

Mr Gauthier : Yes.

Mr F. Wilson : Could there be something less than bilingualism that your organization would accept?

Mr Gauthier : Like in your own law?

Mr F. Wilson : Yes, something short of official bilingualism for Ontario.

Mr Gauthier : The Ontario province is not a purely bilingual province.

Mr F. Wilson : No. That is what I mean. Perhaps you did not understand me. You mentioned that you would like to see Ontario fully bilingual or officially bilingual. Are you speaking on behalf of your organization or personally on that?

Mr Gauthier : If I answer to you, I will speak for myself.

Mr F. Wilson : Okay, I will ask you again. Do you see anything short of going fully bilingual that you would be satisfied with?

Mr Gauthier : Not really.

Mr F. Wilson : You have no other ideas, nothing to expand upon?

Mr Gauthier : Not now, no.

Mr F. Wilson : Okay. Thank you.

Mr Offer : Thank you very much, Mr Gauthier, for your presentation. During the last week we have heard a number of representations, all of which seem to have come to one conclusion, that the status quo for the country is no longer in the cards but rather there is some other form of Canada which is going to emerge in the ensuing months and possibly years ahead.

From your experience, could you share with us what you feel the impact would be on Franco-Ontarians in the event that there is a Canada which is certainly not the status quo as it is now but somewhat of a less united nature, something where the province of Quebec, for instance, has a greater degree of powers with respect to itself and the federal government, something that might not be shared by other provinces? Could you share with us some observations that you may have dealing with the impact that may have on the interests of Franco-Ontarians?

Mr Gauthier : If probably Quebec has more powers than now?

Mr Offer: Yes.

Mr Gauthier: No. That is for the politicians to answer. I am sorry.

M. le Président : Une dernière question.

Mr Martin: You mentioned in your brief that people as well as government must play a critical role in the development of Canada as it will evolve, and I suggest to you that we have been trying that for a while and we do not seem to be getting too far. Do you have any creative solution or answer to how people in government might get together in a way that speaks to less of this animosity that has risen and more to co-operation and moving forward?

Mr Gauthier: My only answer I have to give you is that Ontario must be bilingual.

M. Bisson : Une petite question, Monsieur Gauthier : une des difficultés sur lesquelles le monde essaie de se mettre d'accord, c'est que si on dit, comme pays, pour reconnaître les autochtones ou les francophones au Québec on a besoin de donner des pouvoirs spéciaux, jusqu'à quel point nous en tant que province pouvons-nous aller pour reconnaître les autochtones et les francophones ? À quel point est-ce qu'on dit non ? Où est la limite ?

M. Gauthier : En Ontario ? À quel point vous donnez des droits ?

M. Bisson : Mais non, parce que vous avez dit dans votre rapport que vous reconnaissez que le Québec est une société qui est distincte à elle-même. Vous avez aussi reconnu que les autochtones, en même temps, doivent être reconnus comme une société distincte et qu'il faut leur donner des pouvoirs autant. La question que je pose est : puisqu'on sait qu'il y a du ressentiment en certaines parties de notre population vis-à-vis de cette question-là, jusqu'à quel point est-on capable d'aller rencontrer le milieu du chemin ? Il est où ce milieu du chemin, à votre avis ?

M. Gauthier : Remontant sur le plan des autochtones, c'est reconnaître que les autochtones sont un peuple différent avec des coutumes différentes, avec la langue, en fin de compte — c'est pour faire un «melting pot». Sur le plan francophones en Ontario, je dis si les francophones se sentent bien dans la population de l'Ontario, le ressentiment, il n'y en aura pas face aux autres ethnies. Je ne peux pas le couper en — Vous faites une commission justement pour le savoir.

1330

M. Bisson : Non, non, on demande des idées, c'est pour ça. La question qu'on va trouver, c'est jusqu'à quel point nous comme province pouvons aller pour rencontrer ces besoins. La grosse question, c'est où est ce point-là ?

M. Gauthier : D'accord. Autant, c'est dessus d'autant que vraiment les anglophones soient respectés eux aussi, mais que nous les francophones soyons respectés aussi.

M. Bisson : Je comprends.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Gauthier. Nous avons aussi reçu d'autres mémoires de votre groupe et nous allons les noter.

MAYOR DENNIS WELIN

The Chair: I understand that Mayor Dennis Welin is with us this afternoon, and I would like to give him an opportunity to say a few words to us.

Mr Welin: It is certainly a pleasure for me to be here this afternoon to welcome this commission, which is very important to all our lives and the direction we are going to be taking over the next little while.

I guess what, first of all, I would like to say in my opening remarks is that this is a region that is very troubled by the direction this country has been taking in the last little while. It is an area that is concerned that francophone rights are under attack by many politicians from other centres that really do not recognize the sensitivity of dealing fairly and justly with the major linguistic groups in our area.

Timmins is an area that has a 47% francophone base, an area, I think, that is a good example to the rest of the province of how two major linguistic groups can work in harmony together. I think that what we have shown here is a sensitivity towards one another and that we are stronger because of it.

The francophone fact within the community is vitally important and I am very troubled by the fact that we hear people who are not showing the sensitivity that should be shown towards major linguistic groups such as that.

I am also very troubled when I hear and see people dismiss that Quebec is going to leave us automatically as a given. I think what we have here is a marriage in crisis and what we need is some very sound, sensible counselling to ensure that we find a method of holding this country of ours together.

My grandfather and my father both fought in major wars to ensure that this country be a united country, and I think it behooves us, as leaders within our communities and within our governments, to try to find a common area that we can work together on.

I do not mean that we should give in to every pressure, but we have to be sensitive to the fact that they are unique, and I am concerned that if in fact they do separate or go on a sovereignty-association route, we have to make sure that Ontario does not swing the other way, that we continue to recognize francophone services and rights, that we continue to be sensitive to the needs of the developing of our province and that we develop the type of caring province that will lead us into the 1990s and into the next century.

I think it is befitting that we are in a school today. I know that when you were in Sault Ste Marie you were in a council chamber. I think this is a much better outreach, to get into the high school and hear from young people what their concerns for this country are, because they are going to be the people who are going to have to vulcanize this country together. I can tell you that this is an area that is very concerned about dealing with the issues head on and dealing with the issues in a sensitive manner, and I wish you all the best in your deliberations.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Mayor. Now there is a question, if you would be willing to take it.

Mr Malkowski: I am quite impressed by your presentation and I am in favour of the points. One question I have is regarding the need for a bill for language use in schools to ensure rights, from elementary school right up, and I am wondering, in your opinion, if this were put in place whether this would help the situation.

Mr Welin: I think the best way to encourage a bilingual country and a bilingual province is through the education system. This is a community that has a first-rate French immersion program that offers youngsters an opportunity to be able to learn the two official languages, and I think that the province could look at a better share of funding to ensure that those programs meet the real needs.

I have two sons who are both at this high school. Both have come through the French immersion system, but they find as they get to the upper levels of their education that the opportunity of selection is not as great. I think the provincial government could be well advised to look at a better funding arrangement to ensure that those needs are met, and that they are met by deeds, by actions and by the funding mechanisms that should be put in place.

Mr Martin: It is always heartening to hear somebody speak of a place where the francophone and the anglophone populace are working together in harmony so that the economy can move forward, but I am wondering if there is anything in particular that you can share that makes that happen more, maybe, here in Timmins than anywhere else. I am sure you are aware that all the people travelling the country at this point, looking for answers to the dilemma that we find ourselves in, are looking for the magic that will make Canada that dream, that value that we hold in common that will bring us all to a point of, perhaps, what you have shared with us is happening here in Timmins.

Mr Welin: I think the first thing is that you avoid extremes, that you learn to live and work in harmony. I was born and raised in this community and my dad was a miner in this community for years. It really was important that the neighbours got along and that they understood each other's differences. I think that far too often we play on what divides us rather than what unites us, and what I think unites us, the people in northeastern Ontario, is the need to ensure that we have an economy that provides jobs for our young people, that provides a meaningful outlook and quality of life. I think we have all worked together, both the francophone and the anglophone community, to ensure that.

I am not saying that there are not people who harbour certain prejudices that I think are unsavoury within a community, but I think the vast majority of people want to work together. They see that they have common goals and they see that they have common interests, and I think it is important to develop a sensitivity to one another's differences. I think one of the things that really unites us is that in the north here we have had to fight a lot of the odds: the climate, the transportation, the remoteness question. We have not had the influence of the United States on our back door as much as Sault Ste Marie has had. I think we have learned to be independent and learned to work together

and I think that is an important focus we can share with other areas.

I am not interested in becoming an American. I am not interested in becoming a smaller unit within this major continental society that we live in. I am interested in the strong united area in which everybody contributes and everybody feels welcome and part of, that there should not be anybody within our communities who feels that he is not sharing and contributing a part to that society.

CENTRE CULTUREL LA RONDE

The Chair: Could I call next Jean Lanthier du Centre culturel La Ronde.

M. Lanthier : Bonjour, chers membres du comité spécial. Au nom du Centre culturel La Ronde, j'aimerais présenter notre mémoire concernant l'unité de la Confédération canadienne. Nous aimerions remercier, en premier lieu, les membres du Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération, de recevoir nos commentaires et opinions sur ce sujet qui est d'une grande importance pour l'avenir du Canada en général et de tous les Canadiens.

En même temps, nous devons déplorer le fait que nous n'avons eu que quelques jours pour préparer ce mémoire sur un sujet aussi important que l'avenir du Canada. Vu cette brève période pour sa préparation, les membres du Centre culturel La Ronde ont pu, dans un temps si limité, répondre en détails aux questions présentées dans le document et obtenir un consensus de nos membres. Conséquemment, les opinions exprimées seront de nature générale et nous espérons qu'elles permettront au comité de formuler une position qui permettra à notre province de prendre le rôle de leadership pour sauvegarder la Confédération canadienne.

Nous voulons souligner que nous croyons sincèrement que les raisons principales de ces consultations sont, au premier plan, la sauvegarde de la Confédération canadienne, et au deuxième plan, l'établissement du rôle et de la place de notre province au sein de cette Confédération.

1340

Le Centre culturel La Ronde inc est un organisme à but non lucratif qui est en existence dans la ville de Timmins depuis 1968. Le centre culturel regroupe au-delà de mille familles francophones. Le centre offre une multitude de services aux 20,000 francophones qui se situent dans notre belle ville de Timmins, reconnue comme un modèle du caractère multiculturel et linguistique du Canada. Les services qu'offre le centre à la communauté sont possibles grâce aux centaines de bénévoles qui sont regroupés à l'intérieur d'une quinzaine de comités, d'une quinzaine d'employés permanents et d'une cinquantaine d'employés à temps partiel qui travaillent pour la grande famille qu'est La Ronde.

Le Centre culturel La Ronde fut fondé sur les principes que la famille est à la base de notre société, qu'elle est primordiale pour son succès et sa survie et que tous les membres de la famille y participent avec fierté et fraternité. Le centre a un budget d'opération d'au-delà d'un million de dollars. Il est autosuffisant financièrement à plus de 90%, soit par des entreprises commerciales qui

sont établies dans notre centre ou par des activités sociales, culturelles et éducatives offertes aux membres et 10% par des subventions, soit du Conseil des Arts de l'Ontario, du secrétariat d'Etat du Canada ou d'autres ministères gouvernementaux.

La philosophie de base du centre culturel est qu'il faut participer aux développements de notre communauté en partenariat avec les gouvernements et l'ensemble de la communauté, autant francophone qu'anglophone. Sur le plan financier et au niveau des services sociaux, culturels et linguistiques, la Confédération canadienne visait à rassembler les provinces qui ont toutes des caractères très distincts pour travailler en partenaires au développement de tout le Canada, aussi bien aux niveaux économique, social et culturel. Au fil des ans, grâce à leur distinction prédominante, les différentes provinces ont contribué, par leur structure et programmes, à l'épanouissement et au développement économique, social et culturel du Canada.

Une famille, un pays sont deux structures qui se ressemblent beaucoup. Une famille se développe au fil des ans, un pays fait de même. À un certain moment donné du développement d'une famille, celle-ci éprouve des difficultés et des désaccords, de même pour un pays. À un certain moment donné des joies sont vécues par une famille, de même pour un pays. Les liens qui permettent à une famille aussi bien qu'à un pays de s'entraider et de s'améliorer constamment sont basés sur le respect mutuel entre les individus et l'acceptation que chaque individu puisse développer sa propre personnalité et son propre caractère dans une atmosphère de confiance, de fraternité et d'encouragement.

Nous reconnaissons très bien qu'à l'intérieur d'une famille, chacun des membres n'aura pas nécessairement les mêmes intérêts ou les mêmes objectifs de carrière ou de développement personnel. De même, à l'intérieur d'un pays, chacune des provinces a établi différentes priorités qui répondent à sa communauté, soit au niveau économique, géographique, culturel ou linguistique.

Au fil des ans, les individus et les groupes qui avaient tendance à se regrouper sont devenus beaucoup plus individualistes dans leur philosophie et dans leur développement, au point où nous avons perdu en partie le respect les uns pour les autres et la volonté de travailler à un intérêt commun, soit la sauvegarde de notre pays, le Canada.

Nous sommes très conscients, depuis plusieurs années, de l'érosion de notre confiance et de notre respect pour nos gouvernements, aussi bien au niveau fédéral, provincial et municipal. Nous n'avons qu'à regarder la télévision, écouter la radio ou lire les journaux pour constater l'assaut constant et incessant qui cause la perte de crédibilité et de respect pour nos gouvernements et pour nos institutions fondamentales, les médias, les partis politiques de l'Opposition et divers groupes à intérêt particulier.

Nous déplorons ce fait. Il semble que de plus en plus le désir de travailler vers un but commun est remplacé graduellement et irrévocablement par la confrontation souvent destructive et sans base et par le manque de respect pour les droits des autres. Il semble aussi que beaucoup d'individus ou groupes ne se soucient pas,

même si la Charte des droits et libertés a pour but la protection des droits des individus, elle devrait aussi avoir comme un plus grand but la protection des droits et des désirs communs de la majorité. Est-ce que, ici au Canada, nous avons oublié les principes de base, que la confrontation constante conduira inévitablement à la division ?

Nous croyons qu'il est urgent que nos partis politiques, nos journalistes, nos institutions éducationnelles, juridiques et sociales ainsi que tous les Canadiens reconnaissent et acceptent que la perte de confiance et de respect pour nos gouvernements et nos institutions conduira inévitablement à la séparation du Canada.

Malheureusement, durant les trois années précédant la défaite de l'accord du Lac Meech, la grande majorité des Canadiens et Canadiennes n'ont pas pris l'occasion de participer à l'avenir de leur pays. Suite au Lac Meech, une province après l'autre, à notre opinion beaucoup trop tard, a commencé à faire des études sur le futur de chacune d'entre elles séparément au lieu de regarder un processus général pour la survie du Canada, peut-être bien que le processus qui est en train de se produire à l'intérieur de chaque province est le voeu général des communautés de celle-ci.

Par contre, nous ne travaillons pas à réunir ce pays mais plutôt à regarder ce que chaque province peut retirer individuellement de celui-ci, et non de ce qu'elle peut contribuer en collaboration avec les autres provinces.

Les années 90 sont des années de changements, non seulement dans notre province, mais aussi au Canada et même dans le monde entier. Tous ces changements sont occasionnés par les besoins de différents groupes, différentes provinces ou différents pays de sauvegarder ce qui leur est très cher. Tous ces changements ont pour but d'améliorer le sort de différents groupes ou peuples qui ont en général un aspect positif et bénéfique dans notre société. Nous ne pourrions échapper à la réalité que le reste du monde change très rapidement et que seul un Canada uni pourra réussir à sauvegarder ses propres intérêts. Nous ne pouvons plus maintenir le statu quo. Par contre, comme Canadiens nous devons garder comme principe fondamental que tout changement doit se faire en consultation avec tous les partenaires du pays, ayant comme objectif la réalisation et le développement d'un ensemble et non la division de celui-ci.

Quant à nous, nous reconnaissons les efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario et notre communauté ont investis pour que les francophones d'ici se sentent prenante et participante au dynamisme de l'Ontario et de l'ensemble du Canada.

Comme représentant de la communauté francophone à Timmins, le Centre culturel La Ronde appuie et encourage les efforts du gouvernement ontarien qui ont permis à la communauté francophone de se développer soit par le réseau d'un système d'éducation primaire, secondaire, collégial et nous espérons universitaire, ou par ses programmes qui sauvegardent la protection des droits linguistiques et culturels de nos citoyens. Ceci se fait en permettant au comité francophone de participer activement dans l'élaboration des programmes et dans le pouvoir

décisionnel du développement de sa communauté au niveau des organismes gouvernementaux.

Nous devons travailler à partir du principe d'une famille en acceptant de respecter chaque individu qui fait partie de celle-ci et en acceptant les distinctions qui ont permis le développement de chacun.

L'Ontario est certainement la province qui peut relier l'ensemble du Canada pour qu'il puisse continuer son cheminement dans une atmosphère de confiance, de respect et de fraternité. Le centre culturel se commit à assister activement et dans les moyens possibles à ce projet pour assurer que les efforts et les visions de nos ancêtres durant ces 124 ans depuis la Confédération soient respectés. Nos vœux les plus sincères sont que, durant les prochains mois et les prochaines années, nous tous comme Canadiens pourrions travailler ensemble et arriver à une entente mutuelle pour sauvegarder un Canada où nous sommes tous fiers et reconnaissants d'y vivre et où nous pourrions tous dire avec conviction et fierté : c'est mon pays.

M. le Président : Monsieur Lanthier, il y a des questions, si vous voulez bien attendre.

Mr Harnick : Sir, you have made some very interesting observations, one of which is your perception that the various levels of government are always fighting among one another and that people have lost respect for those government institutions. Do you believe that problem can best be dealt with by making the federal government more powerful or by making the provincial governments have more powers?

M Lanthier : Je ne pense pas directement que le pouvoir décisionnel permettra de résoudre le problème comme tel. Je pense que c'est le bon vouloir des individus, un peu comme vous le faites aujourd'hui, où vous avez un comité qui est formé des trois partis principaux de la province, qui fait le tour de l'Ontario et qui regarde comment on peut s'assurer que la Confédération pourrait fonctionner, ou d'autres solutions s'il y a lieu. Je pense que, dans ce principe, ce n'est pas en divisant les pouvoirs à un niveau fédéral ou provincial ou même peut-être municipal qu'on règlera le problème, c'est en changeant l'attitude des individus.

1350

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I am very moved by your brief because you have said on quite a few occasions within that presentation the word "respect." I did hear you say that you do work with anglophones as well as francophones; I think I heard you say that. You talked about the family unit. You must be doing something to bring people together. Can you talk a little bit about the kinds of things?

You did not seem to focus on the kinds of things that go on at Le Centre. Do you have discussion groups? Is it all cultural activities? Could you say a little bit about how you build—we have already asked your mayor the same question, but you seem to have an activity centre here and I would like to know what kinds of things you are engendering there. Is there anything that has helped you in the legislation that we all know as Bill 8?

M. Lanthier : Je pense que l'atmosphère qui existe entre les francophones et les anglophones dans la ville de Timmins se situe principalement dans le fait qu'on respecte l'autre langue, même si, quand on travaille avec la chambre de commerce, on va possiblement le faire en anglais bien qu'on ait des activités en français à l'intérieur des différentes activités qu'organisera la chambre de commerce au courant d'une année. Et c'est dans le principe que si on demande à M. le Maire de venir aux activités de La Ronde, lui aura la gentillesse de parler en français à la communauté. C'est dans le respect des langues et aussi de la capacité pour l'autre groupe de pouvoir effectuer certaines choses que l'on travaille.

La Loi 8 a certainement aidé ici à Timmins, surtout au niveau des organismes gouvernementaux qui desservent la ville. Par contre, il reste toujours des améliorations à faire et on espère que les gouvernements, en consultant et en impliquant les francophones dans les processus décisionnels, pourront continuer à améliorer ces services. On ne pense pas que, depuis l'application de la Loi 8, on pourra résoudre tous les problèmes des francophones. C'est quand même un bon bout de temps qu'on vit dans un milieu anglophone mais on garde encore l'espoir que, en continuant, les gouvernements pourront ajuster les lois pour qu'elles puissent mieux répondre à la communauté francophone.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Thank you very much. You have given us some insight.

Ms Churley : I am just wondering if you and the francophone community here in Timmins have thought about the possible implications for the francophone community in Timmins, and in Ontario in general, if Quebec were to separate in some form or another. For instance, in another deputation in another place, an English-speaking person—and I am happy to say this was rare—did say that if Quebec were to separate, then we would not have bilingual problems any more in Ontario because, of course, it would not be an issue; it would go away. I am just wondering if you have some fears about that and if you have connections to people in Quebec, French Québécois, to talk about some of the common issues that you have as francophones.

M. Lanthier : Il est sûr que si le Québec devait se séparer du Canada, il serait beaucoup plus difficile pour les Franco-Ontariens de garder le principe de bilinguisme parce que la majorité anglophone serait beaucoup plus grande. Par contre, la force de n'importe quelle communauté, c'est dans le principe de faire valoir les droits de celle-ci. Autant que dans les autres provinces où il y a des francophones, comme à Saskatchewan et en Colombie Britannique, c'est la force de la communauté et des gouvernements qui veulent bien desservir l'ensemble du pays ou de leur province qui va permettre de s'assurer que cela va continuer.

Ms Churley : My second question is, do you have any contact, either loosely or formally, with francophones in Quebec to talk about common issues?

M Lanthier : Au niveau provincial avec l'Association Canadienne-française de l'Ontario, qui a des contacts et des rencontres assez régulièrement avec les gens du

Québec — je me souviens, j'ai participé en 1985 lors de l'Année internationale de la jeunesse — il y a eu des échanges qui existaient à ce moment-là entre l'Ontario et le Québec pour permettre aux jeunes francophones de voir la réalité lorsqu'on est en majorité en français, ce qui est rare pour la plupart des jeunes Franco-Ontariens, la plupart des jeunes francophones, et on avait rencontré à ce moment-là à Québec même un bon groupe de jeunes. C'était intéressant autant que les jeunes francophones du Québec étaient venus en Ontario, à Toronto pour voir les difficultés qu'on devait vivre au jour le jour. Merci, Monsieur Lanthier.

PIERRE BÉLANGER

M. le Président : J'appelle maintenant Pierre Bélanger.

M. Bélanger : Bonjour. Je me présente : Pierre Bélanger. Je suis professeur d'histoire à l'école secondaire Thériault. Je suis habitant du nord de l'Ontario depuis l'âge de deux ans, membre de différentes commissions et puis impliqué, si vous voulez, dans le mouvement actuel de demandes de services d'éducation en français. Je vous propose une synthèse du mémoire que je vais soumettre un petit peu plus tard au comité ; il est en train d'être dactylographié.

Vous savez qu'on n'a pas eu beaucoup de temps pour se préparer. Malgré tout, je crois qu'il y a beaucoup de personnes que je connais, que ce soit des anglophones, des autochtones ou des Franco-Ontariens qui ont considéré comme étant important de soumettre quelque chose quand même à la commission. En tout cas, l'essentiel viendra probablement plus du cœur parce que les analyses, ça prend beaucoup plus de temps.

Si j'ai bien compris le mandat de la commission — et je crois qu'il est d'abord important de décider si l'Ontario doit jouer un rôle important dans ce qui va se jouer dans les deux prochaines années — en tout cas, ce qui a trait aux négociations constitutionnelles dont le but est de garder, je pense, le Québec dans la Confédération. C'est ça qui est la question clé ici, que l'avenir de notre pays est en jeu. Il m'apparaît évident, c'est ce que je vais essayer de vous expliquer, que l'Ontario ne peut pas jouer un rôle qui est moindre que celui qu'avait décidé notre défunt premier ministre Peterson, je veux dire « défunt » au niveau politique.

Je pense d'abord que la tâche qui nous attend va être excessivement difficile. Si vous avez pris connaissance du rapport Allaire, vous savez que le Québec a des exigences qui sont importantes, lui donner les moyens et les pouvoirs de conserver ses acquis au niveau de la population, au niveau démographique ; je pense ici à l'émigration. Rien de moindre que ce qui est nécessaire pour lui pour conserver sa langue et sa culture ne sera acceptable pour le Québec. Il s'agit vraiment depuis Meech d'un minimum.

On aurait peut-être pu s'en tirer avec ça au niveau de Meech, mais maintenant vous savez que le mouvement souverainiste fait des pas de géant. Mes amis qui sont au Québec, que ce soit des anglophones ou des francophones, sont tous d'accord sur une chose : c'est que le Québec peut très bien survivre au niveau économique. Il n'y a plus cette crainte-là, si vous voulez. Ça ne veut pas dire qu'ils ne

sont pas conscients qu'il va y avoir des sacrifices à faire au niveau économique. Il va y en avoir, évidemment, s'il y a un éclatement du Canada, ne serait-ce au niveau technique. On ne serait plus capable de faire partie du Groupe des sept, des pays les plus industrialisés qui se réunissent tous les ans pour décider de l'orientation de la politique économique mondiale. C'est quand même quelque chose d'important. Ça veut dire qu'on n'aura pas le produit national brut minimum pour faire partie de ces organismes.

1400

J'ai aussi des amis autochtones dans le nord de l'Ontario et au Québec et eux vont faire partie de façon très importante de ce qui s'amorce, parce que si on ne satisfait pas à leurs demandes, on pourra pas créer quelque chose de vraiment nouveau, une nouvelle vision qui va faire que tous et chacun vont se sentir acceptés dans ce Canada qui va être capable de faire face aux problèmes que va nous apporter l'an 2000.

Je crois profondément que l'Ontario a un rôle de leader et de médiateur à jouer dans ce processus qui s'amorce. L'enjeu est de taille, c'est la survie du Canada.

Premier argument en faveur du rôle de l'Ontario : je pense que le rôle clé est que l'Ontario est la province la plus peuplée, la plus riche puis celle qui a le plus profité, si vous voulez, du pacte confédératif depuis qu'il existe. C'est aussi la province qui a le plus à perdre avec l'éclatement du Canada, surtout dans le contexte du libre échange avec les États-Unis, avec le Mexique. Il ne faut pas se le cacher, c'est elle qui a la base industrielle manufacturière la plus solide et la plus lourde au Canada.

Et la raison, je pense, qui me tient le plus à cœur, c'est probablement qu'en dehors du Nouveau-Brunswick c'est la province qui a le plus fait pour sa communauté francophone, surtout depuis les dernières années et c'est un argument qui est important. Non seulement a-t-elle beaucoup fait pour la communauté francophone, mais elle amorce des choses qui sont totalement originales et nouvelles quant au traitement de la communauté autochtone. Il y a des ententes qui ont été signées avec les différentes tribus du coin de Temagami qui vont créer des précédents pas mal intéressants pour d'autres expériences dans le reste du Canada.

Il y a aussi un autre facteur qui est important : c'est probablement l'Ontario qui a la plus grosse communauté allophone aussi. C'est probablement elle, malgré les difficultés qu'on a avec la communauté jamaïcaine et les communautés de couleur, qui entretient les meilleures relations avec ses communautés allophones.

Fondamentalement aussi, un des acquis, si vous voulez, du projet Trudeau : c'est aussi la province à majorité anglophone qui compte le plus grand nombre de francophiles. Si on pouvait faire le décompte actuel et exact du nombre d'anglophones qui prennent tous leurs cours en immersion française, c'est probablement supérieur même aux total d'étudiants francophones de la province.

Il m'apparaît important, comme membre de la communauté franco-ontarienne, que l'Ontario puisse conserver cette crédibilité, d'abord en continuant de travailler dans la bonne direction pour ce qui a trait à nos intérêts à

nous : que l'Ontario reconnaisse un statut égalitaire aux communautés anglophone, francophone et autochtone ; qu'elle fasse la promotion de dualité linguistique à son rythme dans la province ; et qu'elle appuie la communauté francophone dans ses efforts de se doter des instruments et des moyens éducatifs nécessaires. Je pense ici au collège communautaire français, à une université francophone pour donner les moyens à la communauté francophone de se donner les outils économiques nécessaires pour être un plus et un apport à l'Ontario. Ce qu'on demande ici ce n'est pas la charité, ce sont les moyens d'exceller nous aussi si on a accès à l'éducation pour réussir en affaires et dans tous les domaines de l'emploi.

Je crois que c'est la même chose que demandent les autochtones maintenant. Ils ne veulent plus être des gens qui sont sur le bien-être social, des gens qui sont aux crochets du gouvernement. Ils veulent une autonomie politique et économique qui leur permettra de réaliser leurs potentiels et de contribuer au pays. Et tout ça justement pour contribuer à la croissance de l'Ontario, tant au niveau économique que social.

Le rôle de l'Ontario va être excessivement délicat, excessivement difficile pour toutes les raisons que je viens de mentionner. L'Ontario va avoir la difficile tâche de convaincre les autres provinces d'accepter de comprendre la nature des demandes du Québec et leur légitimité. En même temps elle va devoir faire comprendre aux Québécois les inquiétudes des gens de l'Ouest, les difficultés et les inquiétudes des autochtones. Moi, j'entrevois ce rôle-là comme étant un rôle de pont et de médiateur aussi. Comme je le disais tout à l'heure, dans ce rôle je ne peux pas concevoir que l'Ontario soit en deçà du rôle que jouait le premier ministre Peterson pendant les négociations de l'accord du Lac Meech. Ce n'est certainement pas par manque d'efforts de la part du premier ministre de l'Ontario de l'époque que l'accord du Lac Meech n'a pas été reçu. C'est pour d'autres raisons qui tiennent au processus, qui n'étaient pas tout à fait accepté et acceptable puis au tordage de bras et à cause du fait que le gouvernement fédéral a trop attendu.

Si vous me le permettez, avant de passer au dernier point j'aimerais mentionner quelques éléments qui devraient faire partie de la nouvelle vision du Canada qu'on devra forger ensemble si on veut s'en sortir.

Évidemment, le Québec doit être reconnu comme une société distincte avec tous les pouvoirs nécessaires pour maintenir cette distinction, pour maintenir les acquis de la langue et les acquis culturels, qu'on pense aux pouvoirs de légiférer sur la langue et à l'immigration, et ça, comme je l'ai dit tout à l'heure, ce sont des demandes minimums. Je pense qu'il est possible d'accorder ceci au Québec sans trahir l'esprit du fédéralisme si, évidemment, on redéfinit le fédéralisme sur deux points très importants : à partir de la reconnaissance de foyers linguistiques et culturels, qu'on pense aux autochtones, aux anglophones et aux francophones, qui doivent avoir les moyens de préserver leurs spécificités, ça c'est la première prémisses ; la deuxième : si le fédéralisme est redéfini à partir d'une distinction claire entre les pouvoirs du gouvernement central, des gouvernements provinciaux et des futurs

gouvernements autochtones, on devrait arriver à quelque chose qui fonctionne. Il faut que l'autonomie des peuples soit la nouvelle prémisses sur laquelle devrait être fondée le nouveau pacte confédératif sans que soient perdus les acquis de l'ancien pacte, par exemple au niveau du rôle du gouvernement fédéral pour ce qui a trait à son rôle d'harmonisateur.

On peut donner des exemples d'acquis du gouvernement du fédéralisme tel que défini, par exemple, depuis 1982. On n'a qu'à penser au rôle du gouvernement fédéral dans le domaine juridique avec la Charte des droits et libertés, avec toute la structure de la Cour suprême que je pense être une des meilleures au monde et qui doit être conservée. On peut trouver d'autres exemples là-dedans.

Il faut un gouvernement central fort dans les domaines de ces compétences mais il faut aussi reconnaître la souveraineté des provinces dans les domaines qui relèvent de leurs compétences à elles. Il faut éviter ce qu'on a connu, ce qui a créé une inflation de la bureaucratie. Il faut éviter qu'il n'y ait dédoublement des pouvoirs qui a redondance dans bien des domaines. Évidemment, les domaines de la politique étrangère, de la Banque centrale, de la défense, par exemple, sont des domaines qui ne peuvent être que l'apanage du gouvernement central. Or ce qu'il faut réussir à faire, il faut décentraliser une grande partie des pouvoirs qui reviennent aux provinces pour créer une dynamique vraiment démocratique qui va permettre aux structures politiques d'évoluer avec la société canadienne.

L'échec de l'accord du Lac Meech s'explique en grande partie par ce problème-là. La constitution n'a pas suivi l'évolution de la population canadienne, les structures non plus. Quand on a voulu réagir et consulter les gens il était trop tard. On a essayé de sauver le bateau d'en haut et ça ne pouvait pas fonctionner. On avait oublié les autochtones là-dedans.

Si je prends position pour un rôle fort de la province de l'Ontario, c'est qu'en tant que francophone je crois profondément en la capacité et au désir de l'Ontario elle-même de créer des conditions de vie acceptables pour les anglophones, pour les autochtones et pour les francophones même si le Canada ne devait pas survivre au référendum qui est fixé pour dans deux ans au Québec.

Finalement, parce que l'Ontario est la province qui a le plus reçu de la Confédération et parce que c'est la province qui peut le plus donner parce qu'elle a le plus d'expérience diversifiée et l'économie la plus forte, il me paraît évident au moment où on se parle, au moment critique de l'histoire de notre pays, que les Ontariennes et les Ontariens et leur gouvernement doivent absolument assumer un rôle de leadership dans la redéfinition et dans le sauvetage de notre pays.

M. le Président : On va passer à la prochaine présentation. Merci.

Je voudrais appeler Lucie Fortin. Est-ce qu'elle est ici? Non, pas encore ?

ÉCOLE SECONDAIRE THÉRIAULT

M. le Président : Le prochain groupe de quatre personnes : Alain Lemery, Chantal Dallaire, Denis Boileau et Rebecca Hawke de l'école secondaire Thériault. Bonjour.

Mlle Dallaire : Bonjour. Nous avons aujourd'hui l'honneur de représenter une classe de 28 étudiants et étudiantes en histoire du Canada de niveau CPO. Comme le sujet l'indique bien, nous sommes préoccupés par l'avenir de notre pays. Nous remercions le comité et le gouvernement ontarien de nous donner l'occasion d'exprimer nos craintes, nos idées et nos espoirs face à notre pays.

Premièrement, nous désirons réaffirmer notre volonté de travailler pour un Canada uni. Nous voulons un Canada d'un océan à l'autre car enfin nous croyons en l'existence de ce pays.

Cependant, la faillite de l'accord Meech nous démontre que le moment est venu de changer et de créer un nouveau Canada. Nous suggérons de décentraliser le pouvoir fédéral tout en conservant certaines restrictions ou pouvoirs.

En tant que jeunes personnes songeant aux études universitaires l'an prochain, nous ne voulons pas, une fois sur le marché du travail, être régit par une constitution qui nous empêcherait de travailler, de voyager ou de vivre librement au Canada. Nous désirons une flexibilité d'une province à l'autre, nous voulons un pays en mesure de nous assurer un avenir solide et stable aux niveaux carrière et revenus et un système de taxe équitable partout au Canada.

Peut-être sommes-nous un peu simplistes, mais je crois qu'il faut s'asseoir et regarder les fonctions de son gouvernement et de sa constitution. Premièrement, on sait qu'il faut connaître les aspirations et valeurs d'un peuple afin d'avoir le bon fonctionnement dans le pays. On n'a jamais eu dans notre constitution une section qui dictait nos aspirations et nos valeurs, car l'ensemble du peuple canadien ne peut jamais venir à être en accord en ce qui concerne les valeurs de ce peuple.

Une question que nous devrions nous poser, c'est : comment pourrait-on tous être en accord dans un pays si vaste et multiculturaliste ? Les besoins et intérêts de l'Ontario ne sont certainement pas comparables à ceux de la Colombie britannique ou à ceux de la Saskatchewan. C'est bien pourquoi le peuple canadien doit être gouverné régionalement afin de combler leurs intérêts et besoins diversifiés. On a juste à regarder les buts économiques des provinces ; ils ne sont pas tous les mêmes. Les provinces de l'Est veulent tout probablement trouver d'autres industries afin de mettre leur part économique au pays. Mais l'Ontario est déjà très riche en ressources et a seulement besoin de trouver d'autres façons de gérer ces ressources afin qu'elle devienne plus productive.

En général je crois qu'on doit donner la majorité des pouvoirs aux provinces, et de cette façon les peuples seraient plus satisfaits que leurs intérêts soient comblés régionalement.

M. le Président : On a besoin de savoir les noms des gens qui ont présentés. Donc, mademoiselle, c'est quoi votre nom ?

Mlle Dallaire : Chantal Dallaire.

M. Lemery : Bonjour. Je suis Alain Lemery.

Nous voulons réitérer qu'il faut repenser notre constitution. Les pouvoirs comme l'éducation et la santé devraient être des responsabilités fédérales. Il y a eu trop de jeux politiques dans le transfert des paiements du fédéral au provincial. Si le fédéral tient tant à sauvegarder les programmes sociaux et le système de santé, qu'il en assume la responsabilité. Aussi, en matière d'éducation, quoi de mieux pour promouvoir l'unité nationale que la même histoire du Canada enseignée en anglais et en français.

De plus, le Québec est une société distincte. Acceptons cette réalité. Donnons aux provinces la responsabilité de l'environnement ainsi que de l'immigration.

Il ne devrait pas y avoir le «double ministère», c'est-à-dire, que soit le fédéral ou le provincial ait entière juridiction sur ses pouvoirs. Il ne devrait plus y avoir de programmes à frais partagés, car souvent le fédéral diminue la somme de paiements, ce qui cause des problèmes aux provinces, comme par exemple le régime d'assistance publique du Canada.

Ainsi, les autochtones qui habitent le Canada depuis des temps immémoriaux sont maintenant les citoyens les plus défavorisés. Il est nécessaire que le gouvernement fédéral rencontre les diverses tribus et leurs chefs pour ainsi parvenir à une entente en ce qui concerne le bien-être de ces derniers. Il faut un plan d'action qui comprendrait : l'autodétermination des autochtones, les revendications territoriales et l'amélioration de la qualité de vie dans les communautés amérindiennes, en encourageant les autochtones à gérer leurs propres affaires et à préserver leur culture, leur dignité, pour qu'ils contribuent plus positivement à la société canadienne.

Mlle Hawke : Bonjour. Je suis Rebecca Hawke.

Le régionalisme semble se refléter de plus en plus au Canada. Que chaque région ait cette liberté de s'épanouir comme elle l'entend. Le gouvernement provincial pourrait jouer un plus grand rôle dans le développement économique de cette province ainsi que dans une série d'ententes ou d'échanges entre les provinces.

L'Ontario doit jouer un rôle de leadership, elle doit être le tour de force qui fera pencher la balance du côté de l'unité nationale. L'Ontario a bénéficié de la Confédération, c'est une province riche qui ne doit pas penser : «Qu'est-ce qu'il y a pour moi ? mais plutôt : Qu'est-ce qui est bon pour l'ensemble de notre pays ?» Nous suggérons que l'Ontario prenne l'initiative et mette sur pied une campagne de sensibilisation à travers les médias pour promouvoir le canadianisme.

En tant que francophones héritiers et héritières d'un riche passé, nous désirons un Canada où un francophone est bien chez lui. Hélas, tel n'est pas le cas si l'on prend les exemples de Sault-Sainte-Marie et Thunder Bay. Il faut que nous, les francophones, possédions nos institutions postsecondaires en français. Ceci altérerait le processus

d'assimilation et démontrerait la volonté des Ontariens d'apprécier notre culture et notre langue.

M. Boileau : Mon nom est Denis Boileau.

En plus, nous nous inquiétons beaucoup sur l'avenir de la nation. Que s'est-il passé pour en arriver là ? Un manque de leadership ? Un manque de vision pour l'ensemble du pays ? N'oubliez pas que vous, politiciens et politiciennes, devez assumer ces grandes responsabilités pour notre génération. Qu'allez-vous nous léguer ? Un pays fragementé ? Il faut vous mettre à la tâche et bâtir un nouveau Canada avec le Québec. Sans cette province, nous perdriions nos racines et le début de notre grande et belle histoire, nous laisserions de côté les compromis qui ont permis à Cartier et Macdonald de fonder une nation. Nous avons le goût du Canada. Ne mettez pas en danger notre avenir. Merci.

M. le Président : Et à vous tous, merci bien. Il y aura sans doute des questions.

M. Boileau : Est-ce que c'est possible de répondre à des questions en français ? Okay ? Merci.

Mr. Martin : It was very uplifting to hear you today and some of the ideas you have, the thoughts and the aspirations for Canada, and the hope that is in your voice.

On a different day and in a different place there was mention made of the cost of the dreams we have for our country, the economics attached to such desires; we politicians were challenged that we are spending money today on a credit card that you, the younger generation, will someday have to pay. Could you perhaps comment on that a little and share with us what your feelings and thoughts are that kind of comment would be?

Mlle Dallaire : Je m'excuse, mais je pense qu'on n'a pas totalement compris les intentions de votre question.

The Chair : I am asking Mr Martin if he could rephrase the question—

Mr Martin : Yes. I said you spoke of such wonderful things for Canada. You had dreams and hopes and aspirations and you challenged us politicians to some action. In a different place and at a different time a presenter challenged us with the cost of such dreams and such activity, and accused us of spending money by credit card that you, the younger generation, will have to pay for, that you will get the bill. I guess I want to maybe challenge you. Have you thought about that, and what response might you have? Does that make any more sense?

Mlle Dallaire : Je vais essayer de répondre aussi bien que j'en suis capable. Comme on l'a dit, on voulait être représentés regionalement plutôt. Donc, si les politiciens reconnaissent nos besoins et peuvent donner priorité à ces besoins, je pense qu'on n'aurait plus de problèmes.

1420

Mr Eves : It is a pleasure to see young people here today taking part in what I consider to be an extremely important process. I was intrigued by the tone most of you took about more flexibility with respect to provincial powers; you talked of regional needs in Canada as well as provincial needs. Throughout last week, I think it is safe to say, the majority of people who appeared before this com-

mittee indicated that they wanted a strong federal government with strong federal powers. You seem to be saying the opposite, that you would prefer to see strong provincial powers and more regionalism in the government of Canada. I wonder if you could expound on what role you would expect Ontario to take in that process, and what your reaction would be, if any, to the Allaire report that has come out of Quebec a few days ago.

M. Boileau : Ce que nous essayions de dire, en donnant plus de pouvoir aux provinces, c'était plutôt de faire une diversité dans les pouvoirs : c'était plutôt afin d'équilibrer les pouvoirs. C'est sûr que le Québec demande beaucoup dans le document Allaire, mais je ne crois pas qu'il soit possible qu'il demande moins après la faillite de l'accord du Lac Meech.

Mlle Dallaire : Vous avez dit que la plupart des personnes semblent vouloir un gouvernement central et fort, puis vous êtes un peu surpris de nous voir demander un gouvernement central faible. On a un pays si vaste, avec tellement de différents besoins ; comment peut-on donner une loi ou des pouvoirs tellement la même base pour des cultures si différentes ? Nos besoins ne sont pas les mêmes que ceux, disons, de la Colombie britannique, qui, eux, sont bien plus anglophones.

Je crois que le pourcentage d'une région va faire que nos besoins deviennent prioritaires dans cette région. Ce qui est bon pour nous n'est peut-être pas aussi bien pour une autre province. Donc, si on est tous satisfaits de ce qu'on reçoit de la province et du gouvernement, je pense qu'il y aura moins de chicanes entre les provinces puis on va être capables de retourner à un pays plus uni et satisfait.

Mr Eves : I did not mean to say—I do not think I did say that I was surprised, but I found it intriguing or interesting that you would come at it from a very different point of view, and I think it is a very refreshing one.

Mr Beer : On parle beaucoup du rôle des politiciens dans toute cette question mais je me demande s'il n'y a pas aussi un rôle pour les étudiants, par exemple. Je ne sais pas si vous faites partie de FESFO, la Fédération des élèves du secondaire franco-ontarien, mais est-ce que vous voyez, entre vous et vos homologues québécois, qu'il y a peut-être un rôle pour les étudiants et étudiantes francophones de dialoguer avec les étudiants du Québec sur ces questions ? Est-ce que ça va être important, en tant que membre d'un chambre de commerce ou d'un syndicat ou d'un groupe d'étudiants, de ne pas simplement laisser les politiciens résoudre complètement ce problème ? Qu'est-ce que vous voyez pour vous, comme étudiants, avec les autres étudiants francophones dans la province, mais aussi en parlant avec les étudiants dans les autres provinces ?

Mlle Hawke : Dans mon petit discours j'avais mentionné une suggestion, de faire une campagne nationale pour promouvoir le canadianisme. On pourrait peut-être faire des annonces à la télévision pour rendre le monde plus respectueux envers le Canada en tant que Canada uni ou par les différentes cultures. Ça serait un projet national, peut-être provincial. Et puis municipalement, ou peut-être entre l'Ontario et le Québec, je pense que ça pourrait se faire aussi, même dans les écoles ; on pourrait

promouvoir l'unité canadienne et puis ça serait un bon projet. Ce n'est pas juste national, ça pourrait fonctionner municipalement entre les écoles, entre les cultures. Ce serait une bonne suggestion.

M. Winninger : Il y a plusieurs groupes multiculturels qui voudraient avoir les mêmes pouvoirs, les mêmes droits que les groupes francophones. Qu'est-ce que vous pensez de cette idée ?

Mlle Dallaire : Je pense, en ayant le respect pour l'un et l'autre, que c'est important de respecter leurs demandes et, de même encore une fois, je pense que le régionalisme aidera à ces cultures à se promouvoir. Si dans une certaine région spécifique une culture veut promouvoir ses propres besoins, d'abord ces gens seraient comblés par ces régions-là, cette province.

M. le Président : Merci bien de votre participation.

PERRY JAMES

The Chair: Could I call next Perry James?

M. James : Bonjour. Mon nom est Perry James. Je suis né au Québec. J'ai fait mes études en Alberta, en Ontario, au Québec et au Nouveau-Brunswick. Mes parents, grand-parents et arrière-grands-parents sont d'origine française, écossaise, irlandaise, allemande et micmac de la Nouvelle-Écosse. J'ai marié une Franco-Ontarienne de Cochrane. Et je suis présentement à enseigner le français comme langue seconde à Englehart.

I will make that presentation entirely in English, a language I learned by choice 10 years ago. My first language is French, but I see it as an honour to use my second language in front of your commission.

I envy the American people. You may ask: Why talk about the American people today? I do envy them, because they respect their document called the Constitution. They study it right from childhood. Despite many disparities and injustices, the American people do rally behind the flag in time of national crisis. Canadians, on the contrary, seem to split in time of crisis. We have to find someone to blame.

What about our Canadian Constitution and our bill of rights? Do we accept, as Canadians, that the Constitution should and must be the foundation of our nation? Nine provinces have signed the Constitution, Ontario included. Do they respect their signature? Unfortunately, it appears to me that the Constitution is only a piece of paper that we ignore as if it does not exist.

Could we stop and study our Constitution? Are we this great nation we pretend to be? We are all here in front of this commission debating the future of Canada while our soldiers are at war in the Gulf. When those brave soldiers are protecting the values we all share, do they look upon themselves as French Canadian, English Canadian, Italian Canadian in the battle? I do not think so. Can the Premier or the Prime Minister of Canada show a bit of leadership and decency by stalling constitutional talks while we are at war?

Are we this great nation we pretend to be? Our Constitution tells us that French and English are equal. If we do not believe that Canada should be officially bilingual, then we are not respecting our Constitution. We are the second-

largest country in the world and we are saying that we cannot accommodate two languages. Switzerland, a small country with a population of 7 million, has four official languages: German, Italian, French and Romansh, the Romansh language with a population of 50,000.

In the last 15 years these are the things I personally witnessed in Canada on the language issue. I saw Quebec becoming unilingual French. I saw some 50 municipalities becoming unilingual English in Ontario. I saw Bill 101 telling francophone parents: "You have no more rights to send your kids to the English school. Only the rich can now, through the private school."

I saw French Canadians compared to the AIDS virus. I saw the Canadian flag being stepped on. I have seen the Quebec flag being stepped on. I saw pamphlets selling Canadian educational products with French in the section of foreign languages. I saw radical associations, English or French, using statistics to describe and prove a point, by ending at the sentence "(without Quebec)" in the English radical ones, and in the French ones "(without Canada)."

1430

I saw associations and people whining against French education for Franco-Ontarians or French francophones outside of Quebec. I have never seen one MP in Quebec in the National Assembly standing up against that, against the right of education for the anglophone. You may be surprised one day if Quebec becomes independent. They will put it in their constitution.

I saw francophones, professionals out west, being told by VPs, "Can you speak English in the staff room?" I saw English Canadians promoting that the French Canadians are not the founding people of our nation, and I could go on and on and on non-stop.

All those radical associations have, in fact, hidden agendas. One is to make Quebec an independent country at any price and the other is to eliminate any trace of French culture outside of Quebec. Other ones are promoting that English is a superior language in the rest of Canada or that French is a superior language in Quebec.

Can we stop and study our Constitution? Can we be nation-builders? When our leaders are showing lack of leadership and hiding in the closet, those radical associations are taking over the national agenda. This national agenda is for hurting people around them and, you know, they are taking a pleasure in it. Enough is enough.

Are we this great nation we pretend to be? I see those provincial leaders creating protectionist barriers that slow or stop interprovincial mobility of labour while in the same times our great nation is opening the right of American workers to come into Canada. I see provincial leaders having a feeding frenzy for federal powers. Let me quote you Jacques Parizeau, who is presently the president of the Parti québécois in Quebec, who talked in Toronto in 1968: "As long as it is only Quebec who is demanding powers, it could work, but if other provinces start doing the same, the federal government will face incoherence and chaos." This is what we have right now, chaos.

I see the right for provinces to use referenda affecting national issues. Why does the federal government not use the federal powers of a referendum? This is what William

Davis, in return for his approval of the repatriation of the Constitution, told Pierre Elliott Trudeau: "I am willing to back you on the repatriation of the Constitution without Quebec, but you are going to take the constitutional right of the federal government to use referenda." And he did so. That is Bill Davis.

I see provincial leaders using the "notwithstanding" clause. It is easy to blame Mr Bourassa right now, that he used the "notwithstanding" clause for cultural issues. But do you know who proposed the "notwithstanding" clause? It was Richard Hatfield, Premier of New Brunswick, who said during the constitutional talks in 1981, "Mr Trudeau, if you want my approval, you are going to have to give me that clause." Who is blaming Mr Hatfield?

To all the provincial leaders who have approved the repatriation of the Constitution, without the approval or the signature of Quebec, were you real nation-builders? Are we this great nation we pretend to be? I see my actual Prime Minister lacking a vision of Canada. He is supposed to talk tomorrow, and listen to him. Maybe he will have one tomorrow. Although, considering his lack of popularity in Canada, I would suggest that the Prime Minister create parameters of any future constitutional debate.

First, you should not accept, Mr Mulroney, any negotiations that will make Quebec independent. Let them do the independence. Second, sovereignty-association is unacceptable for the majority of Canadians. Third, you are willing to negotiate but you have nine other provinces. Do not forget the frenzied thirst for powers. We have already heard, "What you give to Quebec, we'll have." Okay? A great future.

Are we this great nation we pretend to be? I do not see enough effort to understand and listen to the plea of natives concerning their land claims and their right for more autonomy. We may argue who founded this country 130 years ago, but do not forget they were the first nations 30,000 years ago.

Are we this great nation we pretend to be? I see multiculturalism becoming a tool of assimilation, wrongfully. Too often I have noticed those comments: "If we let the French have their schools, then let the Italians and Chinese, etc, have their own schools." Another comment: "You can have your own culture in your house. But don't ask me to pay for it, to promote your culture." Another quote I have heard too much: "You can wear your turban, but don't wear it at work." By those kinds of comments, they are asking multicultural groups to be themselves but only on a part-time basis. Is that what we want to make them feel as Canadians? Unfortunately, many Canadians find multiculturalism as assimilation or melting pot.

My presentation may show some of the bitterness and disillusion, but mostly it is a condemnation of the intolerance of the few. I believe it is not the majority of Canadians. Most Canadians are people of goodwill, but those intolerant, vocal few are convinced, and that is the drama, that Canada, tomorrow, is one without Quebec, without the right of Quebecers to protect their culture, without the right of natives to have self-government and without cultures being different from their own.

If Quebec goes, who is going to be next? Let them talk. Let them do what they want. You will have your Canada, but I will not stay in that kind of Canada for sure.

The Chair: Mr James, if you could sum up, please.

Mr James: Yes, I am almost finished.

The Canada I want is the Canada where people can be themselves and can be respected for their differences. Canada is the second largest country in the world and we should not forget regional differences. That you may be Newfoundlanders, Québécois, Westerners or Maritimers does not make you less Canadian. It only reflects a reality.

The crisis we have now is due to many factors not included in this presentation. We are now witnessing the clash of two visions of Canada. We are witnessing the decline of various cultures and nothing is done about it. We are witnessing English superiorists and French superiorists working hand in hand.

I believe we should strive for excellence and find a reasonable compromise. Canada will never be the perfect country. Excellence can only be a goal. Let us not build walls when all the walls are falling. Let's strive for excellence, which should be the first goal. Respect our Constitution and make Quebec sign with dignity, because one way or the other, Quebec will not lose its dignity. They are distinct and they know it.

This time, the Quebecers will not make the mistake to ask the rest of Canada to approve of their uniqueness in Canada. They may choose another road to be themselves, but I hope we will still have, as Canadians, enough sense of compromise to be builders of our nation. We have to put an honest and strong effort to remain united. If not, we will have committed a crime against humanity. Canada will be history.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

1440

VIC POWER

The Chair: We will move on to Vic Power.

Mr Power: Mr Chairman and honourable members of the select committee, first may I congratulate you upon having selected Timmins as the site for today's session of the committee on Confederation.

The topic you are researching is important but, in my opinion, the Constitution ranks second to the economy, for this is a period when plants are closing and people are losing their jobs right across the province and, sad to say, northern Ontario is not immune from this disease. Personally, for the young people who are coming out on the job market as well as for the experienced workers who are facing difficulty in securing employment, I am certain that it would be far better to focus our energy and attention on the economy rather than the Constitution.

Having said that, Ontario does have the pivotal role to play in the constitutional process. In doing so, I would urge that this province insist on a strong central government. To read news reports that the federal government has set up a task force of senior civil servants to work on the dismantling of the powers of the federal government is distressing, disturbing and, to say the least, disappointing.

This would fly in the face of the vision of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Right Honourable William Lyon Mackenzie King, the Right Honourable John Diefenbaker and, in most recent times, Lester Pearson and Pierre Elliott Trudeau, not to mention all the people who have built this great country.

I grow weary of those who say that Canada is not working, that Canada is a failure. If it is, why then are we the envy of the world? Make no mistake about it, all of us must be Canadians first. Only three provinces pay more into the federal Treasury than they receive. These provinces are, of course, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia. All the more reason for us to insist on a strong central government so that Canadians maintain and enjoy national standards from sea to sea.

All of us have benefited from the network of social programs in place as a result of this broad view of Confederation. If Canada is to progress economically and politically, we should demand for future generations nothing less than a strong central government. In my view, Mr Chairman, Ontario should lead the way.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. You have made it very clear that you feel there is a need for a strong central government. We have heard from presentations that there is also the need to address interests on a regional basis and that there is a feeling that maybe the central government is not the place to do that.

I am wondering if you might be able to share with us how one can balance those two needs. The first, on one hand, is the need for a strong central government. Yet, on the other hand, there is a growing concern that regional interests, not only in this province but throughout the country, are not being addressed at the central level and that there is the need to address them potentially at a provincial level. I would like to get your thoughts on how best to address both those issues.

Mr Power: I do not know that they can be reconciled perfectly or completely, but we do know that Europe is pulling together, the United States of Europe. Even Great Britain is going to go on a different currency in a year and a half's time. They are not going to have the pound sterling any more. They are going to be on the Eurodollar, or whatever currency they determine to have in Europe. So if Europe is pulling together, I cannot see why Canada should be falling apart.

I think that we have to pull together towards the centre. Certainly we have to recognize regional interests and certainly the rights of all peoples, French, English, native, people whose origin at least is from other lands, must be respected and recognized. But at the end of the day you have to have a strong central government.

Could you imagine right now if we had to make a decision about going or not going to the Persian Gulf if we had to consult 10 different provinces? I think that we would not have a strong medicare system if we did not have transfer payments coming out of Ottawa to the less fortunate provinces. And so on it goes.

The same can be said really for education. While education is a provincial responsibility, somewhere there has

to be a strong federal government that can make transfer payments to the provinces to make education just as important in Newfoundland as it is in Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia.

The Chair: I just have one question myself. You mention at the beginning that you thought that the issues of the economy were in fact more important, or at least as important as the question of the Constitution. I wondered if you could comment. Certainly from my perspective, it does not seem that it is a question of separating those two issues. I wondered if you had any thoughts on the kind of role that Ontario could play in the debate around how we, within ourselves first of all, can become more competitive and better respond to the needs of our citizens. At the same time, what role can we play in the Canadian sphere on economic issues?

Mr Power: There is no doubt that Ontario has been the engine that makes the Canadian economy run. All I am saying is that at this difficult time, not just in southern Ontario where some of the smaller plants have been closing—and there may be reasons for that; for example, free trade—but even in northern Ontario, we have had a lot of difficulty, if you look at Sault Ste Marie, if you look at Elliot Lake, if you look at Temagami, if you look at the closing of the Adams mine at Kirkland Lake. We are not without problems here in Timmins.

I am saying that constitutions are for comfortable middle-class people to talk about in the comfort of a parlour. But jobs are really the most important. I think we have to get down to bread-and-butter issues. If we solve the bread-and-butter issues, I think the other problems will tend to solve themselves.

The Chair: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

PATRICK BAMFORD

The Chair: I call next Pat Bamford.

Mr Bamford: I will introduce myself. I was born and raised in northern Ontario and spent most of my working life here. I will not say how long ago that means, considering my age. Also, I work in this school here as a guidance counsellor. Some people would say that that is a contradiction in terms, work and guidance counsellor, but that is what I do.

To state the obvious, the most significant factor at this time affecting our Constitution is the relationship of Quebec to Confederation. One can best understand the present relationship through a historical perspective.

From the earliest days of Nouvelle France signs of cultural-national identity were already evident. The cultural tenacity of this people of the early 1800s, who had already been established in North America for two centuries, is understood in retrospect by a serious underestimation of the famous Durham report.

Confederation, useful for economic and political security of the pioneer region, never diluted the nationalist feelings of the people of Lower Canada. On the contrary, over the various years various decisions of the federal government were seen as frustrating this cultural-national identity but

never subduing the deep-rooted feelings. One of the defence mechanisms in this regard has been the uncanny ability to vote en bloc in federal elections to gain as much control over the decisions of Confederation as possible.

1450

In more recent decades, nationalism was served by a voluntary opting out of many federal programs. This meant that Quebec administered the national programs with federal money under the flag of Quebec, so to speak. The best-known example of this arrangement is the Quebec pension plan administered in lieu of the Canada pension plan.

You will recall the shouting of "Vive le Québec libre." This was not an unfortunate mistake by a foolish politician, but a well-orchestrated expression of a reality many of us have chosen to ignore. More recently, Robert Bourassa's proposal for renewed federalism is not surprisingly nothing less than a more explicit statement of nationalism by demanding most of the remaining powers of a sovereign nation with the notable exceptions of external affairs, defence and monetary policy.

It is, in my opinion, the final step before achieving the ultimate destiny and fulfilment of the nationalist aspirations of Nouvelle France, which have been expressed at times more eloquently than others in the political events in the regions over the years.

To say that the language decision in the northern town of Sault Ste Marie, or the dancing of a few misguided characters on the Quebec flag in eastern Ontario, or the rejection of the Meech Lake accord by the first nations people, is pushing Quebec out of Confederation is to admit, in my opinion, that one has never fully understood the historical aspirations of the people of Quebec.

Quebec's separation, like the public view a few years ago of divorce, is seen as something wrong or immoral, and therefore some evil person must be responsible: for example, Clyde Wells, Elijah Harper, Mr Mulroney or the people of Sault Ste Marie. On the other hand, most of the people of Quebec accept their nationalist feelings as positive and natural. It is the rest of us outside of Quebec who see it as a threat or an evil since it frustrates our own view of Canadian nationalism.

The failure of Meech Lake, for goodness' sake, was not the cause of Quebec nationalism, but a temporary, albeit emotional frustration in the natural process of maturation of a culture towards greater self-determination and nationhood. I, like many of you, am not happy with the situation, but that does not eliminate a reality that we must acknowledge if we are going to deal with it.

The possibility of separation is seen by many outside of Quebec as a failure. Therefore, it is important psychologically to have a scapegoat. Beware of scapegoating in the next few years.

A January poll in Quebec indicated approximately 70% of its citizens favour political independence. Industry Minister Benoît Bouchard, after travelling throughout Quebec, recently said: "It's my impression that they've already left." Events are moving very quickly, so what are our options for the future?

It is clear to me that Quebec nationalism has reached a political reality such that a Confederation of equal provinces is no longer acceptable. In the final analysis, I believe we will ultimately arrive at one of three possible scenarios.

The first scenario is one that I find totally unacceptable, but is one that seems to be rapidly unfolding. This is the situation where Quebec assumes a position of dominance in Confederation by virtue of special powers akin to those of a sovereign nation and simultaneously by virtue of electing federal MPs who continue to have a major say in the affairs of the rest of Canada.

In a desperate effort to quiet the crescendo of Quebec nationalism, the federal solution has been to throw money in massive dosages into Quebec, to concede federal contracts in inordinate proportions, to offer a veto on constitutional reform, to offer extra senators, to implement a bilingualism program outside of Quebec in such a panicky, clumsy fashion that it has only served in large part to alienate, dislocate and frustrate the careers of many Canadians.

A recent sample of this first scenario of the evolution of Quebec dominance in Canadian affairs is the federal decision to develop the Hibernia oil field off Newfoundland with the proviso that major contracts be tendered in Quebec.

All this, I believe, must be very amusing to the nationalists in Quebec, but in the end inconsequential and ineffectual. On the other hand, though, it is serving, however inadvertently, to place Quebec in a privileged and dominant position in Canadian affairs, casting Quebec in the involuntary role as spoiler, big bully, spoilt brat or chronic complainer, whereas all Quebec really wants, in my opinion, is respect for the right to be *maîtres chez nous*.

Hence the dilemma: It is not logical by definition for a sovereign nation to exist as part of another sovereign nation. It is the implication of this painful reality with which the rest of us outside Quebec must come to grips.

I would like to interject at this point from my written text to indicate that I believe it is also immaterial to the nationalists in Quebec whether Ontario declares itself bilingual, but it is not immaterial to the citizens of Ontario. If this committee, as some media are intimating, recommends official bilingualism for Ontario, in my opinion it will serve no purpose as far as Confederation is concerned, but may very well cause a severe backlash in Ontario and far more harm.

I do not see the percentages of it for a government to enter into unnecessary controversy. My best advice is to tread softly. I am on record in this community as a member of the hospital board as supporting wholeheartedly the provisions of Bill 8 and the provisions of French-language services, and I believe that given time Bill 8 will accomplish what it was intended to do.

The Chair: Perhaps you could sum up, please. We are getting near the end of the time.

Mr Bamford: The second scenario is a mutually beneficial agreement between two sovereign nations—Quebec and Canada—the latter comprising a union of nine provinces and two territories. The relationship would probably

co-manage such things as defence, fisheries, the St Lawrence Seaway, etc. This is what I believe is meant by sovereignty-association.

For those of us, and I include myself, who have difficulty visualizing such radical changes in the arrangements of Confederation, this is at first blush an unpalatable situation. Yet on closer examination when one analyses what the alternative scenarios are, one must come, I believe, to the inevitable conclusion that this is the only practical and honourable way to deal with Quebec nationalism and at the same time to retain the rest of Canada as a single nation.

The third scenario is probably the most likely, but in my opinion as unattractive as the first. That is a form of economic community of sovereign Canadian states. I believe that Premier Robert Bourassa's recent proposal of renewed federalism is nothing less than a blueprint for just such a Canadian common market of independent provinces or regional states. Prime Minister Mulroney, as it appears, will offer the same substantial powers as demanded by Quebec to the other provinces, confirming the direction where all this is leading.

I believe this direction is unacceptable and that the Ontario government must resist the temptation to weaken the central government, even if the current Prime Minister begs to give its sovereignty away. To maintain a real national identity we must maintain the powers of a strong national government. Ottawa is not our enemy in this regard; she is our friend. The biggest danger in the short term that I see, in the heat and desperation of negotiations to attempt to maintain a semblance of Confederation, will be deals that compromise for ever the ability of the other nine provinces to continue as a single sovereign nation.

The Chair: Mr Bamford, I am sorry to interrupt you again. You will have to just sum up. We are beyond the time allotted.

Mr Bamford: But I only have two more pages.

The Chair: I know that, but I have to be as fair as I can to all the people who are speaking before us. We have the brief and we certainly can read it. If you want to sum up with your final comments on it, we would appreciate hearing those.

Mr Bamford: The reality of this third scenario will likely unfold faster than we can imagine. Already Mr Vander Zalm is requesting controls over immigration similar to those being negotiated with Quebec—

The Chair: Mr Bamford, I will give you 15 more seconds and then I am just going to cut you off.

Mr Bamford: I have a summary, some conclusions or recommendations, and you have my report if you would read it, please.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr Bamford: In summary, I would recommend that the Ontario government take a leadership role in maintaining a sense of national identity and national vision for all of Canada.

Do not allow the federal government to negotiate unilaterally constitutional arrangements with Quebec or any

other province. Negotiating the Constitution is the prerogative of the college of provinces.

Be wary of the political attractiveness of negotiating Confederation at any cost.

Resist the temptation to accept or negotiate further provincial powers that will weaken the national government.

The final recommendation is most difficult for me to say. If negotiations fail to keep Quebec in a provincial mode, have the political fortitude to resist negotiating a make-believe Confederation but instead allow Quebec to negotiate its national independence with dignity.

Finally, to the members of the commission, you are to be commended for your efforts on behalf of Ontario for our great nation. I wish you Godspeed in your momentous task.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Bamford, for a thoughtful presentation.

I just want to check with the members of the committee before proceeding. I am not sure if the next group is here or not. Is Gilles Gagnon here? Okay, we are slightly—well, actually we are not, we are about on time and we do have a couple of other groups that we have added to the list. I just wonder if the committee wants to take a five-minute break to get up and stretch? We will do that. We will break for five minutes and we will be back in as close as we can to five minutes, folks. Thank you very much.

The committee recessed at 1505.

1524

CORPORATION DE LA VILLE DE HEARST

M. le Président : Si je pourrais appeler Gilles Gagnon de la municipalité de Hearst. M. Gagnon.

M. Gagnon : Monsieur le Président, Monsieur le Vice-Président, mesdames et messieurs, membres du comité, au nom de la Corporation de la ville de Hearst, j'aimerais d'abord remercier le gouvernement ontarien de donner la chance à la population et aux groupes ontariens d'exprimer leurs opinions sur ce sujet vital qu'est l'avenir de notre Confédération et le rôle de notre province à ce sujet. J'aimerais également remercier le comité de nous avoir donné la chance d'exprimer notre point de vue à cet auditoire aujourd'hui.

Hearst, situé à 270 kilomètres au nord-ouest de Timmins, est reconnue pour sa bonne chasse et sa bonne pêche mais surtout pour son caractère canadien-français prédominant alors qu'environ 85% de ses 6200 habitants sont de langue maternelle française. Cette majorité de citoyens de langue française et le fait que l'industrie forestière de notre région, ses entreprises, ses institutions et ses organismes ont été fondés et sont en majorité gérés par des francophones fait que Hearst a été baptisé par plusieurs comme le petit Québec de l'Ontario.

Hearst et sa région immédiate, comprenant la Corporation de Mattice-Val Côté et plusieurs villages, forme une région économique d'environ 10 000 personnes dont la majorité est francophone. C'est une région dynamique avec un esprit entreprenant qui fait qu'elle est toujours avant-gardiste dans plusieurs domaines économiques et

sociaux. C'est une communauté et une région qui, sans l'ombre du doute, a la volonté d'assurer la survie de sa langue française et de vivre de façon prospère dans la langue française. Toutefois, la majorité des francophones a assumé ce droit dans le respect des droits des minorités.

La ville avait fait les manchettes des médias nationaux il y a des années, alors qu'on avait su que la ville de Hearst était déclaré bilingue en 1978, non pas dans le but de respecter les droits des francophones mais pour respecter ceux des anglophones, fait inusité dans une communauté hors Québec.

Notre région est hospitalière et chaleureuse, où les cultures cohabitent harmonieusement et même collaborent ensemble pour le mieux-être de notre région. Étant situés dans une région d'interéchanges commerciaux et qu'un effort concerté était nécessaire pour le développement de la région, les quatre communautés de Hearst, Mattice-Val Côté, Hornepayne et la réserve indienne Constance Lake First Nation formaient il y deux ans une corporation de développement économique régionale afin d'aider la région à diversifier sa base économique et à devenir plus autonome.

Cette association en est une de trois cultures — francophone, anglophone et amérindienne — et le nom adopté par la corporation, Nord-Aski Frontier Development, est un jumelage de trois langues : «Nord» en français ; «Aski», le mot cri pour «terre» ; tandis que les mots anglais «Frontier Development» définissent plus clairement la région et l'objectif de l'association.

Lors du débat sur l'accord du Lac Meech, nous n'avons pas pu nous empêcher de penser que les politiciens auraient dû regarder en notre direction pour voir comment les trois cultures dominantes du pays peuvent cohabiter et travailler ensemble pour le mieux-être général.

En fonction de notre expérience, je crois parler pour la majorité des gens de notre communauté quand je dis que nous reconnaissons que le Québec est une société distincte et que cette province devrait avoir la permission de rapatrier certains pouvoirs distincts dans le but de pouvoir assurer la survie de la langue et la culture française, rapatriement des pouvoirs qui n'enlève rien à l'Ontario et aux autres provinces et qui permettrait de garder cette province dans la Confédération canadienne, qui à notre avis est d'une importance capitale.

Les communautés autochtones constituent également des sociétés distinctes et devraient jouir d'un degré d'autonomie leur permettant de gérer leur présent et déterminer leur avenir. Tout ce que ces communautés veulent dans le fond, c'est d'avoir la chance de se développer de façon la plus avantageuse possible sans rien enlever à ses voisins. À ces moments critiques de l'histoire de notre pays, les Ontariennes, les Ontariens et leur gouvernement doivent prendre un rôle de leadership, de médiateur et de communicateur pour garder notre pays ensemble. L'Ontario peut et doit jouer un rôle prépondérant dans le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays et dans le rapprochement des différentes communautés.

Basée sur sa puissance économique et sa force d'attraction industrielle, elle a moins de demandes fondamentales de changement et peut ainsi jouer un rôle

de médiateur pour le rapprochement des différentes régions du pays.

1530

Plus important encore, à cause de la présence du demi-million de francophones dans la province, de nombreux groupes multiculturels et d'une présence importante de communautés autochtones, l'Ontario est donc bien placée pour signaler aux autres provinces du Canada l'importance de maintenir des liens étroits et fructueux entre les différents éléments de sa communauté, de vouloir développer en parts égales tous les membres de sa province pour qu'ils se sentent tous membres à part entière d'une province et qu'ils participent à l'économie et au développement de cette province et du pays. Nous le disons aujourd'hui, l'Ontario pourrait prendre en exemple des régions comme la nôtre pour prouver que l'union fait la force et que la division crée de la faiblesse.

Notre région et tous les francophones de l'Ontario reconnaissent les efforts du gouvernement et du peuple ontarien en ce sens. Mais l'instant est grave, et il faut agir rapidement pour sauver notre pays d'un éclatement qu'on regrettera peut-être à jamais.

En cette période déterminante de l'avenir du Canada, nous demandons que ces efforts soient poursuivis et intensifiés pour montrer l'exemple aux autres provinces et démontrer au Québec qu'ils doivent faire partie de notre Confédération.

En ce qui a trait aux objectifs de développement de la population francophone, nous recommandons que le gouvernement de l'Ontario se déclare officiellement bilingue tout comme le Nouveau-Brunswick pour assurer une meilleure transition entre le Québec et l'Ouest canadien ; que le gouvernement de l'Ontario déclare que les communautés anglophone, francophone et autochtone aient égalité de statut en Ontario ; que le gouvernement de l'Ontario remette aux francophones la gestion de leurs institutions d'enseignement ; que le gouvernement de l'Ontario ait de l'avant avec l'établissement d'un collège de langue française, de même que d'institutions universitaires de langue française ; et finalement, que l'Ontario fasse la promotion de la dualité linguistique dans la province.

Merci beaucoup.

M. le Président : Merci. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? M. Offer.

Mr Offer : Thank you very much. Just one short question. First, let me thank you for your presentation. During your presentation you stated that Quebec is a distinct society and therefore has the right to assume enhanced powers in negotiation between that province and the federal government. In your opinion, is the right for Quebec to assume these enhanced powers or indeed to negotiate with the federal government founded on the principle that it is a distinct society, thereby it might exclude other provinces; or is there in your opinion the right of all other provinces to negotiate in the same way that Quebec is doing with the federal government?

Mr Gagnon : Well, I would think that the duality of our nation, in terms of francophones having been given

certain rights on the onset and the majority of francophones living in the province of Quebec, would give them this distinct society status in order to protect this language among hundreds of millions, really, in North America. So it is in that vein that I see the province of Quebec having a special status. It has already started, as you are aware, in terms of control of immigration.

Mr Offer: Thank you.

M. Beer : Il y a un an, vous avez parlé à plusieurs reprises au sujet des problèmes du fait français, des problèmes qu'ont les francophones dans la province, et je me demande, et ce serait peut-être utile pour nous du comité : après un an de la crise linguistique, est-ce que vous voyez qu'il y a un changement d'opinion ? Je pense qu'il est important de souligner que non seulement Hearst mais bien d'autres municipalités se sont aussi déclarées bilingues. On a beaucoup parlé du mouvement de l'unilinguisme, mais en même temps, si je me rappelle bien, il y avait une cinquantaine ou une soixantaine de municipalités en Ontario qui se sont déclarées bilingues. Alors après un an, qu'est-ce que vous pensez de la situation ici dans le Nord vis-à-vis des relations entre les groupes anglophones et francophones ?

M. Gagnon : À ma connaissance, je pense, comme on dit en anglais, «the dust is settling». Étant en contact avec certains gens de ces villes-là, on me dit d'une part qu'il y a encore des problèmes et d'autre part que c'est mieux de laisser l'affaire s'arranger par elle-même, que le temps va panser les choses. J'espère que c'est ça la situation.

Mr Martin: I hear from your presentation certainly an urgency to do something that will save the country in front of the present challenge. From listening to other folks and, I guess, a sense out of my own guts that some of the reasons we are in the problem we are in right now is because of maybe too much urgency, I think we as Canadians or Canada as a country, as a young country, relatively, when you see other countries, and we are evolving in a way that up until—you know, things were moving along, Ontario was. Bill 8 and I think other things were beginning to happen. And with Meech we had the sense of urgency and then finally a time line; it had to be done by this date or else. I am wondering if you are able to think of—because I cannot—a way of slowing this thing down so that we can get hold of it with both hands and move it at the speed that it needs to move so that we can do it right.

Mr Gagnon: Well, whether it is a perception or not, this thing of Lake Meech and the declaration from Sault Ste Marie, Thunder Bay and other municipalities—as a personal experience, this year I had the opportunity to go to the 350th anniversary of the arrival of my ancestors very close to Quebec City. They came here in the 1640s. For your information, the Gagnon family is the most numerous in America, with the Tremblays. I had the opportunity to talk to many people from the province of Quebec. Of course, even though they came from all over the world, in the United States and Mexico and so on, there are still quite a few who came in from Quebec because we went to the ancestral land. And when I talk about urgency, I had a feeling that, whether it was a perception, as I said, there is

this sense over there of wanting to separate, which would be «efface» for the country.

Mr Martin: There were some images thrown around this morning too, that were shared this morning too that you use now, and I think maybe we have to begin to look for new images and metaphors, and it may be a different language even in front of this challenge.

You talk of family and I can resonate with that and I think maybe if, more and more, we talked as family rather than as distinct nations and that kind of thing, we might be able to come up with some new way of putting this agenda back on the right track and moving ahead with it. Terms like “respect” and “understanding” I think happen more readily within family, where people love each other and care for each other, than they do when you consider perhaps strangers in communities separated by the distances that we have in Canada.

Mr Gagnon: Well, I agree that we should be a family here in Canada, but within that family there are distinct cultures—like the natives, like the French culture, and like the English culture—that formed the basis of this country, and I would hope that within that family we can recognize that.

The Chair: Further questions? Merci.

Mr Gagnon: Thank you.

The Chair: If I could call next Dorothy Wynne from the Kapuskasing Native Women's Group. No? Okay.

1540

GARY WHITMAN

The Chair: Gary Whitman.

Mr Whitman: Ontario in Confederation: We have got the good, we have got the bad and we have got the ugly. Will Canada survive the onslaught of the federal government and the Quebec government? It is difficult, at the least, to distinguish one from the other, as they are so intertwined and self-serving. Now Ontario has joined the ranks, with secret meetings between Bourassa and Premier Rae. Canadians would like to know what is going on between these two.

Maclean's weekly, 4 February, informs us of Quebec's deadline on independence if its demands for the seating of new powers is not granted immediately. Is this what Rae and Bourassa were discussing?

Confederation has been very good to and for all the provinces in Canada. The federal government must not give up any powers, not to Quebec or any of the other provinces. If anything, they should acquire more.

Having said that, allow me to explain.

Our present system of government, federal and provincial, is really not working. The one great reason for this is they refuse to listen or represent the large majority of Canadians. Only minorities, it would appear, are listened to, especially since Trudeau came to power. The Trudeau Constitution is a first-class example of the misuse of power. It was written by self-serving bureaucrats and had absolutely no input by the Canadian people.

This worthless piece of paper was used by Quebec to silence the 25% of English-speaking Quebecers, a sizeable

minority. Quebec refused to sign the Constitution but used it anyway. Make sense? Not likely.

A twit had managed to put a "notwithstanding" clause into our supposed Constitution. What we as Canadians must do now is redefine the meaning of parliamentary democracy. The Canadian people must have an impeachment bill and procedure to be able to remove prime ministers and premiers who have become megalomaniacs. Our backbenchers have no backbone for the job. A bill must be created to recall MPs who refuse to represent their constituents. Now the party line, which is the dictatorial power of a prime minister or a premier, is a must for investigation in the immediate future.

The new governments will be we the people, of the people, with the people. The time is fast approaching when we will have to elect separately the premiers and the Prime Minister.

Why has the New Democratic Party supported Bill 8 when only 58 members were present for the vote? This does not even represent a quorum. In fact, of the 58 present, not all voted in favour of the bill. Peterson kept it very secret until it was leaked by a concerned employee over a year later. If this is democracy, we are in trouble.

Do you people know what democracy means? Of course you do. Let us now put democracy to the test. Call a referendum on Bill 8 and be done with it. Allow the people of Ontario to decide if they want to cater to a 4.2% minority. Enforced bilingualism, known as Bill 8, is costing too much and has caused more problems and animosity between the different linguistic groups than what it is worth.

Everyone in North America is descended from ancestors who came from somewhere else. The North American Indians were the first founding people in the new world. Then came the European. Without the help of the natives, the second-comers never stood a chance of survival. These facts are well documented in history. The idea of the English and French being the two founding nations is at best a sick joke.

As citizens of this country we have to put a halt to being called hyphenated Canadians; for example, English-Canadian, French-Canadian. If you are born here in Canada, you are a Canadian; no more, no less.

Under the disguise of multiculturalism, we have been duped. Multiculturalism disguises the thrust of Frenchification in our society. Peterson was quoted in the Timmins press 2 August 1990, "I will fight to the death for minority rights in this province." What hogwash. In reality, all minorities are protected from discrimination and guaranteed equality under the law as any other citizen of Canada. We believe Peterson meant special rights for the 4.2% minority of French descendants in Ontario.

The massive amounts of money being poured into Frenchification of Ontario could be put to better use in educational programs to help all citizens of Ontario and not a few élitists who have been created by such legislation as Ontario's Bill 8, the federal government's Bill C-72 and Quebec's Bill 178. However, what goes around comes around.

We know of no Canadian who hates anyone who can speak a second language. We do, however, object to being told we have to speak a foreign language to get or hold a job. Jobs are being taken away from English-speaking persons and given to French-speaking people who can barely speak or understand English. Where is your bilingualism now?

What is Canadian culture? English, French and many others have Christmas trees at Christmas. We all sing Christmas carols like Silent Night. We tell our children about St Nick and Santa Claus. Hey. Heavens. The tree comes from Germany. Silent Night and many other popular Christmas carols were written in Germany. Santa Claus comes from Holland.

We have all taken the best from all cultures and adopted them as our own through natural evolution. It is not possible to legislate culture or to force a foreign language on a people who do not accept it, as you people damned well know by the backlash on Bill 8.

My ancestor was heavily involved in Confederation in 1867. I find it my duty to my country to carry on what he and John A. Macdonald started. At this time 65% to 70% of Quebec was other than French. An example: There were Scottish, Irish, English, Dutch and German from Pennsylvania. There were people from Norway, descendants of the Vikings. There were Welshmen and about every other country represented, too numerous to mention. The Empire Loyalists had come to stay.

We would like to know what history is taught in French schools. Canadians are under the misunderstanding that Quebec is a French province. No way; sorry. The French colony was ceded to Britain in 1759 and thus became an English colony. Because we have allowed Quebecers to change names from English to French, does not change a thing. It does prove we are tolerant, but we believe that tolerance is coming to an end.

France's President de Gaulle's "Vive le Québec libre" is still galling in our throats. Try as he might, de Gaulle had to face the fact that French had slid to 18th place in world languages. All the French colonies revolted against their rulers. Vietnam is a good example. He thought he still had Quebec. Trudeau kicked him out of the country as an undesirable alien. De Gaulle told or ordered the science community in France to create French words to replace English terminology. They tried and failed. As one scientist said: "You can only hyphenate so many French words. Then it becomes nonsense."

1550

Quebec, the spoiled brat of Canada, wants to split and run away, but run away with what? Quebec does not own the south shore. It does not own Ungava. It does not own Rupert's Land, and the narrow strip of land on the north shore was ceded in 1759, so why are we talking about our place in Confederation? Because Quebec will demand the sink and Mulroney, because he is a Quebecer, will give Parizeau the whole damned kitchen.

We have all heard of Quebec's intention to separate and take with it, by force if necessary, the northern half of New Brunswick, Labrador and northeastern Ontario and turn it into a French-speaking nation. This, we tell you

now, will not happen by whatever means. The governments must be changed to represent the majority or as Canadians we are doomed to extinction. Confederation has built this wonderful country and what our forefathers have built, let no man put asunder.

I only have two or three more remarks to make and I am finished. Whatever happened to the politicians who cared for their country? Whatever happened to the people who would fight to the death for their country? It would appear that party-line politics has killed democracy. Many things must change before the heat of the summer, when tolerance is at its lowest. My last statement I address to Mulroney: It is a damned shame that the only thing Mulroney has done right is to put us in a bloody war.

Questions?

The Chair: Yes, if you would like to hold on, there are a couple of questions. Before I open it up for questions, I guess one can agree or disagree with a number of the points that you have made, but regardless of that, I think it is important to point out that certainly French is not a foreign language in Canada. It is the other official language, one of the two official languages in Canada. I think just for the record that needs to be clear.

Mr Malkowski: You brought up a perspective in some of your concerns which I appreciate. As to your point regarding the elimination process and the input process, or lack of it, do you have any suggestions or can you be any more specific, possibly implementing a referendum or any examples of how, as you would like to see, we might be able to get rid of the Prime Minister or MPs, as you were mentioning?

Mr Whitman: First of all, sir, I never said we had to get rid of MPs or the Prime Minister or anything, but occasionally if we had the threat where we could recall them if they do not do their job, if they do not serve their country, then, down the road—as for a referendum, I believe most people believe that referendums should be held at the polling booth. No, I do not believe this is necessary at all. Government mail, as I understand, passes through the post office free of charge. Is that right?

Interjection: Federally.

Mr Whitman: In Ontario we pay; the federal government is for free. Well, we can make a deal with the post office. But anyway, a questionnaire could be very easily sent to every registered voter in Ontario and returned, punched in on a computer and if the answer came back one way or the other, if it came back for bilingualism, I would for ever hold my peace and if it came back saying "No more bilingualism," as the French say, *c'est la vie*.

Mr Beer: I think, Mr Whitman, that one of the important things about our hearings is that people can come forward and share with us their sense of their vision about the country and the kinds of values that they see underpinning it. I think it is also important that in that exchange we all be very honest and straightforward with one another. It is perhaps not surprising, then, that a lot of the basic points that you make, I simply disagree with.

I think that when you look at the history of this country, whether one likes it or not, with the native peoples and

then the English and French and others coming after, we have built a country where we now have a Constitution that may not be to your liking, but which a lot of people worked very hard and very openly to bring about.

I cannot let pass your suggestion that Bill 8 was passed in the dead of the night. It was debated as was any other bill in the Ontario Legislature. People came forward and expressed their points of view. We have had several elections in this province since that bill was brought forward, and I would argue that in a democratic system there has been full and open debate. Again, one might not like that bill, one might not like the way it has perhaps been administered, but it has been done openly and it has been done with full discussion in the province.

I think that what we have to do and what we are doing now, part of what this committee is all about, is trying to determine, is there within this country a consensus around what kind of country we want to have? In my view I believe that if we are going to have a country called Canada, we are going to have to have respect for the English and French languages in this province, in Quebec and in New Brunswick. Others may feel differently.

Mr Whitman: I could not agree with you more, sir, yes.

Mr Beer: But I think that those are issues that we are trying to come to grips with and the language one is going to be very critical. My sense is that your thought is that this has been a problem for the country and that we really should be a unilingual country. Is that correct?

Mr Whitman: Sir, first of all, I would like to correct you. There is a difference between Bill 8, which is enforced bilingualism, and natural evolution bilingualism, shall we say. For a lot of people I met who grew up in Timmins, their last name is as German as mine and they slip in and out of English and French like I would a pair of socks. I have no problem with that whatsoever. But bilingualism, so many people say no, no, no, when you force it on a person to get or hold a job, and when you cannot speak—one time I heard you could speak English or French. No, now it is French. When you replace an English person with a French person who cannot speak English, this is not bilingualism, sir.

In Kirkland Lake where I was born, we always had many, many people of many different backgrounds. Everybody spoke a common language, English. We had no problems with anybody who spoke any other language. You grew up with it. It was so natural to see little three-year-old kids who are English—my grandson is two years old. His babysitter's father is Italian and the mother is French. He comes home to Grandpa and it is not a cat any more; it is a minou. He comes over and he has a few expressions now in Italian too.

Now that kid is going to grow up bilingual, but easy. A lot of people are not linguistic, unfortunately. You see somebody who drives a school bus for 15 years and every kid on that school bus speaks English, and she loses her job because all those kids are going to French immersion. I am sorry, but like I said before, tolerance is coming to an end.

Mr Harnick: Sir, you appear on our agenda representing a group called the Concerned Citizens of Northeastern Ontario. You have not told us anything about your background personally, nor have you mentioned who this group is. Can you tell me who this group is, what kind of an area they cover, how many members you might have and whether you are affiliated with any other groups.

1600

Mr Whitman: No, we are not affiliated with any other groups. The Concerned Citizens of Northeastern Ontario was got together, and we have the Spicer commission coming to Matheson.

Mr Harnick: Well, no, I appreciate you are not the Spicer—

Mr Whitman: No, that is what the committee is for.

Mr Harnick: Just a second. You are not the Spicer commission. Who are you? We know who the Spicer commission is. Why do you not tell us who you are?

Mr Whitman: My name is Gary Whitman.

Mr Harnick: I know that.

Mr Whitman: Okay. What else do you want to know?

Mr Harnick: How big is your organization? How many members do you have?

Mr Whitman: Members? In the committee, I have about 20.

Mr Harnick: All right. Gee, I mean, northeastern Ontario is a big area. How big an area do you cover?

Mr Whitman: Right now, it is from Timmins to Kirkland Lake.

Mr Harnick: And you have 20 members?

Mr Whitman: No, I have 20 people on my committee.

Mr Harnick: Well, how many members—

Mr Whitman: There is no membership in that. There are no dues.

Mr Harnick: Well, how many members do you have?

Mr Whitman: There are no members.

Mr Harnick: Ah, thank you.

Mr Whitman: The committee is to bring people together to the second-string Spicer commission.

Mr Harnick: Okay.

The Chair: One last quick question, hopefully, Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: One of the things you alluded to in your presentation was the question that the people within the province or the people within the country have to have the right to be able to recall their politicians if they feel they are not doing something right. You also alluded to the point of having a situation by which the population itself would be able to decide major issues according to referendum.

I just have a short thing to say, then I want to ask you the question. The first thing is that we have just had an experience, for example, of referendum in the United States in the last congressional elections where every major environmental piece of legislation that was put forward

to a referendum was lost. I have to ask myself the question, why? I guess one of the answers is, he who has the most bucks shall win the referendum, and I have a bit of a hard time trying to understand that.

But the last thing is that when you made the allusion to being able to recall the politicians, I think it sounds great on paper and it sounds like a good idea, but do you not think that it is going to put the people in a situation where the politicians are going to be so darn scared to make any decision that they will in effect not be able to do their jobs in any kind of way, because they will always be afraid, "If I say this, this group will be mad at me over there. If I say this, the other group will be mad at me. Therefore, I'll make no decisions whatsoever," and we will have total chaos? What is your opinion on that, because that is what I see out of this?

Mr Whitman: The thing is, you are absolutely right.

Mr Bisson: Do you want chaos? Is that what you are advocating?

Mr Whitman: No. You are right in your scenario when you say politicians will be so afraid that actually no legislation will get done.

Mr Bisson: So what you are advocating is to have no legislation.

The Chair: Mr Bisson, let Mr Whitman answer the question.

Mr Whitman: Thank you. No, I am saying you would have to almost commit murder before such a procedure would ever be taken, even considered. Also, it would have to take a certain percentage, for example, on a—what do you call that when you get all those signatures?

Mr Bisson: Petitions.

Mr Whitman: A petition, yes. It would take so many signatures on a petition to even implement such a thing. I mean no, just for somebody to walk in and say, "Hey, I'm getting you out of that office because"—no, it would not work that way at all, Mr Bisson; no way.

Mr Bisson: I wish we lived in a perfect world.

Mr Whitman: Oh, no, we will never get that.

TIMMINS NATIVE FRIENDSHIP CENTRE

The Chair: Could I move on next to Raymond Tremblay. No? Okay, Morris Naveau from the Timmins Native Friendship Centre. Mr Naveau, go ahead.

Mr Naveau: My name is Morris Naveau and I am representing the native friendship centre. Good afternoon. Glad to meet you guys.

Okay, first of all, I want to start off with the Constitution. What is the Constitution? I ask myself the question sometimes, what is it? Well, it is supposed to be like a mirror. When we look at it, we should see ourselves, but we never do as native people. The reflection to date of native people has been a series of negative images, as we all know; to name a few, drinking Indians, unemployed, lazy and many more. We have been called so many names.

Past governments have always made major decisions for native people. There is no participation process for native people. It does not work and it will never work. It

will never work because native people have never been involved or asked to be involved. The government must now shift from an active, doing role to the job of assisting native people in processing their own decisions. That means self-government. I think it is time for native people to get their own self-government.

Today, Elijah Harper is a national hero because he said no. This was not an impulse no, it was a rational no. It was the response of thousands of native people from all over this country saying no, simply to stop everything until native people everywhere can be heard and listened to before decisions are made.

For example, here in Timmins, an urban centre with approximately 2,000 or 3,000 native population, there are six reserves within two hours of this city, yet aboriginal people here do not have the right to what they are entitled to. The Indian Act states that native Indians do not pay tax anywhere, yet young people or adults who are living in Timmins because there is no secondary school in their community pay taxes. To me this is an absurd regulation, very unfair to my people. It makes me sick sometimes to even look at it and listen to it day after day on TV. No matter where an Indian lives, he is never going to change. He is always going to be an Indian. Why do we have to pay tax wherever we live?

Government moneys are now being spent to support a war which is killing young people and many people whose culture we do not even understand. This is not a justification for what Hussein is doing, yet Canadian tax dollars are going to foster this war. Native and Canadian people are now being asked to support the government spending by paying the GST, not only native people but all people. It is ridiculous and sickening.

Native youth and adults need education programs which include native languages and culture. These cost money, yet government programs are being cut back drastically every year. Post-secondary funding for students is limited and social services agencies such as friendship centres are suffering from cramped facilities, limited funds for programs, inequity of staff wages and limited financial resources for professional development and research. I know the government has to do more for the friendship centres and for the native people. There is not enough.

Once again, it makes me sick what this government is doing to the native people of this country, yet they hear people talking in here and saying, "Well, the French and the English." What about the Indians? We have been here a long time. My grandfather—you can go 200 years back. Still we are in the same boat. Nothing. The government has taken most of our land away and you only give me 15 minutes here to try and get it back. That is ridiculous.

In conclusion, I would like to say that native people in leadership roles should become a government priority. Leaders have followers and good leaders need to be part of the true visible minority. It is time for native people to start getting involved with government issues. I think the government should start accepting that, if you want to see something that is going to work with native people and non-native people, you are going to have to start getting them involved in all aspects of job, issues, no matter what.

1610

We are very lucky that we are living here in Timmins. Timmins is a city here that accepts native people to work in its workforce. I am proud of Timmins. I could not say any more for Timmins, but I am very proud to live here today in this city because it is one of the cities that accepts native people. At the end I should say that native people must be seen and heard and involved in all aspects of government issues. That is all I could say. That is the challenge: Change for the better. You are talking about natives again. Foreigners, French language, English language—what about the native people? We are just starting in the school here, in Timmins High, to put in native culture and native language. That has just started but there should be more native people getting into the workforce and sitting on different government jobs.

It will always be the same unless you start getting native people in there. If you do not, you are going to have another Oka. I will bet you that, because the native people are so fed up with what the government has been doing to the native people. They have been pushed around for the last 200 years. I am 45 years old and I have not seen a change, just a little. Is that what my son and kids have to go through next after me? It is ridiculous, yet the government wants me to listen to it. I am not going to listen to it. I respected the government at one time but not any more because it does not listen to me anyway. Why should I listen to it?

None of you know how I feel. You are just staring at me as if I am another grieving Indian. I am not grieving. I am hurt inside. Now you are listening. I am proud of that. Thank you very much. I will let my friend here do a little bit.

Mr Cheechoo: Good afternoon. My name is Gilbert Cheechoo and I would like to make a few comments, in addition to what Morris had to say. We are here I guess talking about the Constitution. These are some of the feelings that I have gathered over the years in discussing these issues with a lot of people. I have a lot of family and friends who are politicians, so we do talk a lot about politics. I came with Morris to share some of these things that we have come across.

When you talk about the Constitution, you talk about sovereignty, and you always have to remember where sovereignty comes from. Sovereignty comes from some place, and it came from our people. When Brian Mulroney said there is no issue with the aboriginal people for sovereignty, he forgets where his sovereignty comes from.

When our treaty was signed in 1905, our people allowed the Canadian government to use our land as sovereignty. That sovereignty did not come from the Queen, the King. That sovereignty came because the King said in 1763: "You have to deal with the aboriginal people as nations. Before you go and take their land you must sign a treaty with the aboriginal people. Then you have the right to declare sovereignty, but other than that you are going to declare sovereignty over lands that do not belong to you." As they say, when you steal land you are not a land owner; you are a thief. This is the thing that we have been trying

to get across over the years, that what we are asking for and have always asked for has scared a lot of people.

We, like Morris said, do not want to be another Indian whining here. We have not been whining. I will tell you one thing: There is no nation in this world such as ours that has to pay for human rights with its land and with its rights and its dignity and its pride. There is no other nation in this country that has given up its culture, its way of life, its land, for human rights. The right to exist, to eat, to be healthy, to have housing—this is the thing that we are paying. We are paying, my friends. We are paying with our land, which is us. The aboriginal people: who they are is the land.

Like our elders said, it will be hundreds of years before the European will ever take root into this land. It will take him hundreds of years before he will treat this land like it is his, as if it belongs in his heart, as we do. Every time we say, "You guys cannot destroy our territory. You are destroying us and our way of life for hydro development, for resource exploitation," that land is us. It is connected with us. Our roots are deep. You will cut our lifeline. You do not have a lifeline in this country. You have a supply. This is our lifeline. The land is us, who we are.

And, my friends, when we talk about our human rights, the right to housing, education, health, guess what? Two hundred thousand excess square miles was assigned under treaty for those basic rights that each and every one of you here received. Even if you came into Canada today, you will get the same things that we are getting and we are paying for with our land and our rights to that land and our rights to self-government, our rights as human beings, who we were, Ininew, Nishnawbek people, what God gave us. That is what we are paying for. There is no other nation in this world that pays for human rights—like me telling you, "I will use your land, but the guarantee I give you is I will let you live."

For example, today we have what we call a rural rehabilitation assistance program under CMHC. You talk about double standard. You talk about exploitation and abuse. We have this housing program that is given to our people, and under this housing program you cannot qualify if you are making over \$23,000 a year off and on reserve. This is open to all Canadians. They gave it to us because we cried: "Our housing is poor. We don't have enough moneys from Indian Affairs." So they gave us the RRAP.

When you are on a reservation, my friends, your Canadian dollar is worth nothing. Believe me, I worked as an adviser for business development here in Timmins for aboriginal people. Your Canadian dollar is worth nothing because once you cross that reservation boundary line, there is no economics. There is no return on investment. You cannot own a house. You cannot own land. You cannot even use ten, five, whatever thousand dollars' worth of equipment, hunting, trapping, boat motor, car.

Whatever you spend your money on, you cannot use it as collateral if you want to start a small business or borrow some money or whatever, because you are not allowed under the Indian Act, under present legislation. So, my friends, there is no return on investment on anything that we do. There is no economics. When that happens, you

become a welfare state. All your policies that say, "We are going to help aboriginal people to be self-sufficient," ain't going to work because of that.

1620

So this housing program comes to us. You compare it with yourself. I did with one of the local MPs, Cid Samson. I told him this before and I said to him, "You compare yourself to this scenario." I live on a reservation. I make \$30,000 a year off the reserve. I work hard for that money. So I come back home. My house needs repair. That house does not belong to me; it belongs to Indian Affairs. They let the band council look after it and they call it self-government, so they give it away. I live in there and it needs repairs.

I go to the RRAP, which was so generously given to us, and I have to take out of my pocket because I cannot qualify. I make over \$23,000 a year. If I need my repairs, cannot get any money from the band. I have to take it out of my pocket and put it in a house that does not belong to me. Where is my return on investment? The guy that makes less than me gets qualification for \$6,200, so he upgrades his house.

You take a white person or a non-native person or even an Indian off a reserve and you stick him in that same scenario with his own house. If you put \$5,000 into your house, you might appreciate the value of that house. So it is worth it when you are making \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 to help yourself because your house is going to return that on you. You can take it to the bank. Same thing with the guy that is making \$13,000, \$14,000 or less. He too can take his house to the bank after he renovates it.

Where do we take our money? Which bank do we go to? There is a double standard in this country. What happens to a hardworking guy like me when I put money into a house that does not belong to me on a reservation? I do not get any money back because everything is worth zero. You might as well give us a voucher.

You see, that is the fundamental problem when you talk about the Canadian Constitution that people forget. The government sends out a task force to study the Indian. They should send a task force to study themselves. Where do you get your ideas from? If it is not good for you, then why give it to us? If it is not going to work for you, why give it to us? That is what we are saying. There is a double standard. If you cannot treat us that way, then the French people, the other minority people, the English people, whoever, are going to fall victims to that thing, the same thing that is going on, and that is a good excuse to avoid things, you know. We do not have time.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I just want to say that I do not think any of us presumes to know what it is like to be in your shoes, but I think that we are trying very hard and sincerely to understand some of the problems that we have to cope with as a government. I think that our government has committed itself to acknowledging the needs of native peoples and the right to self-government, but I think each of us knows that it is going to take more than words for the credibility to be established, that it is going to take concrete actions. I think all of us are conscious of that.

Mr Naveau: Well, that has been going on for the last 200 years, you know.

The Chair: Exactly, which is—

Mr Naveau: You have to take action. That is what we want: action.

The Chair: I think we acknowledge that that is the need that has to be there. Thank you for your presentation.

We will move on to Lucie Fortin. Est-ce que Mme Fortin est ici ? Non ? Jean Lantin ? Gary Prudhomme ? Caroll Jacques ? Dorothy Wynne ? Sorry, sir, you are ?

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO, RÉGION DE KIRKLAND LAKE

M. Jacques : Caroll Jacques. Je n'ai pas présenté par écrit parce que je devais me présenter mercredi à North Bay, mais c'est plus court pour moi de venir ici parce que je suis de Kirkland Lake. Mais vous allez avoir d'ici quelques jours ma présentation.

Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, région de Kirkland Lake est heureuse de pouvoir vous présenter son point de vue sur l'avenir du Canada et en remercie le comité.

La région de Kirkland Lake compte environ 5000 francophones et s'étend des frontières du Québec à l'est ; de la région du Tri-Town au sud ; de la région de Cochrane au nord ; et Matachewan à l'ouest. La région comprend les villes de McGarry, Larder Lake, Kirkland Lake, Englehart et Matachewan.

Je désire parler brièvement sur cinq points. Premièrement, comment pouvons-nous assurer notre avenir au sein de l'économie mondiale ? Nous sommes assurés que le Canada peut et doit jouer un rôle actif au sein de l'économie mondiale, notre caractère bilingue nous permettant de communiquer avec presque la totalité dirigeante des pays et notre approche multiculturelle nous permettant de mieux comprendre l'ensemble de la population mondiale. Nous ne pouvons pas, par contre, sacrifier l'un par rapport à l'autre.

Deuxièmement, nous devons absolument trouver une solutions aux attentes amérindiennes au Canada. Nous préconisons l'autonomie des groupes amérindiens et une approche de développement économique et culturel pour et par les amérindiens ; un exemple : la suppression du ministère des Affaires indiennes, tant au niveau fédéral que provincial, remplacé par un gouvernement amérindien élu par les amérindiens.

Troisièmement, l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada devra continuer dans la mesure du possible. Mais il faut lui permettre de se développer et non juste de survivre. Nous reconnaissons le caractère distinct du Québec et son droit à décider de son avenir au sein du Canada dont il décidera la manière.

Quatrièmement, le rôle du français et de l'anglais au Canada : les francophones hors Québec ont un pays qui s'appelle, comme pour les anglophones, le Canada. Tous ceux qui pensent que si le Québec se sépare, ceci éliminera automatiquement le français au Canada peuvent s'attendre à des surprises. Le français et l'anglais doivent,

indépendamment de la décision du Québec, demeurer les deux langues officielles au Canada.

Cinquièmement, l'Ontario devra continuer de jouer son rôle de leader au sein du Canada. L'Ontario devra donner l'exemple en déclarant le français et l'anglais langues officielles en Ontario, et ceci pour des raisons tant sociopolitiques qu'économiques, car grâce à cette approche, l'Ontario demeurera au plan mondial un partenaire de choix des pays et anglophones et francophones.

Merci de votre attention.

M. le Président : Merci, monsieur. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Non ? Merci.

I will just go through the list of the remaining speakers one more time. Dorothy Wynne. Lucie Fortin. Jean Lantin. Gary Prudhomme. All right. Seeing that none of those people have responded to the call, I just wonder before we close if there are any other individuals or groups in the audience who wish to make a comment to us. We would be happy to entertain those now. Seeing none, we will recess until 7 o'clock this evening. Thank you very much.

The committee recessed at 1630.

1633

SOCIÉTÉ DES UNIVERSITAIRES DE LANGUE FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

M. le Président : On va reprendre avec Raymond Tremblay, de la Société des universitaires de langue française de l'Ontario.

We have copies of the brief here. We will distribute them once the clerk has had a chance to register them.

M. Tremblay : Je vous remercie, Monsieur le Président, d'avoir réussi à convaincre les membres de votre comité de patienter encore un petit peu pour recevoir notre mémoire. J'ai préparé un petit texte que j'aimerais vous lire. Il est relativement bref et je pense qu'il contient les idées majeures que nous voulons soumettre à votre comité ici aujourd'hui.

Même si les questions que votre comité a le mandat d'examiner sont d'une envergure à en donner le vertige, nous tenons à vous remercier de l'occasion que vous nous donnez d'en discuter avec vous. Nous voulons vous parler aujourd'hui surtout des aspirations et des intérêts sociaux et économiques des francophones de la province, et il nous semble que ces aspirations et ces intérêts sont les mêmes : que l'Ontario s'associe ou non à d'autres provinces.

Par exemple, nous ne voyons pas pourquoi les droits linguistiques et culturels des Franco-Ontariens et des Franco-Ontariennes devraient être respectés seulement dans un Canada dont le Québec ferait partie, alors qu'on pourrait nous déposséder de ces droits dans un Canada dont le Québec ne ferait pas partie.

Nous ne pensons pas que nos aspirations en tant que francophones soient tellement différentes de celles des autres résidents et résidentes de l'Ontario. Nous voulons une société non seulement tolérante mais respectueuse des individus et des groupes qui la composent.

En conséquence, l'Ontario ne devrait accepter de s'associer politiquement qu'à des entités qui partagent ces objectifs. Il ne serait pas exclu que, dans cette perspective,

la reconnaissance du Québec comme société distincte puisse être considérée comme une manifestation concrète de ce respect que nous avons pour les autres. Nous pourrions même imaginer que l'Ontario voudrait lui aussi avoir le statut de société distincte pour avoir un contrôle aussi étendu que possible de ses propres destinées.

On a généralement tendance à associer l'Ontario au reste du Canada anglais, mais il faudrait voir si l'Ontario n'a pas plus d'affinités avec le Québec qu'avec les autres provinces du Canada. L'Ontario et le Québec sont les deux provinces les plus peuplées du pays, et tous les deux comprennent des groupes minoritaires de langue officielle de plus d'un demi-million de personnes. Des échanges culturels pourraient être développés encore plus entre ces deux provinces en reconnaissance de l'enrichissement collectif qu'apporte la présence dans une même société des langues et des cultures autochtones, française et anglaise. Les autres provinces pourraient être invitées à se joindre au tandem Ontario-Québec, mais il ne devrait jamais être acceptable que l'une ou l'autre des minorités ne soit pas respectée dans quelque coin que ce soit de ce nouveau pays. Pourquoi donc nous associerions-nous à des gens qui ne partagent pas nos principes les plus fondamentaux ?

À notre avis, en Ontario comme ailleurs, le respect de la minorité francophone devra se manifester de façon très précise : d'abord en reconnaissant le français comme l'une des deux langues officielles de la province, et ensuite en laissant aux Franco-Ontariens et aux Franco-Ontariennes le contrôle de leur destinée, entre autres par le biais de la gestion de leurs propres institutions. Ces choses se font déjà pour la minorité anglophone du Québec.

La Société des universitaires de langue française de l'Ontario considère que la communauté ontarienne ne pourra qu'être renforcée par l'épanouissement de sa minorité de langue française. Fondée en juin 1989, la SULFO compte déjà près de 200 membres en provenance des quatre coins de la province. Cette société regroupe des professeurs d'université, des administratrices, des administrateurs, des professionnels du milieu universitaire ontarien, des chercheurs ainsi que des étudiants et des étudiantes des deuxième et troisième cycles universitaires.

À l'heure où la communauté francophone de l'Ontario revendique ses institutions postsecondaires autonomes, le milieu universitaire souhaite apporter sa contribution à cet important débat, et c'est pour cette raison que les universitaires de langue française se sont regroupés en se donnant les objectifs suivants :

1. Promouvoir l'éducation universitaire de langue française en Ontario :

En regroupant les personnes désireuses de mettre leurs forces et leurs talents au service de la communauté franco-ontarienne de façon à ce que celle-ci puisse profiter de ses ressources universitaires tout en les faisant fructifier au maximum ;

En collaborant à la conception et à la mise en place de structures organisationnelles qui soient appropriées aux besoins des Franco-Ontariennes et des Franco-Ontariens à chaque niveau des trois cycles de l'éducation universitaire ;

En exigeant des mesures pour assurer la formation d'un contingent suffisant de Franco-Ontariennes et de Franco-Ontariens capables d'œuvrer en français dans les différents secteurs de la vie universitaire, soit l'enseignement, la recherche, l'administration et les services à la communauté ;

En agissant comme porte-parole auprès des autorités gouvernementales pour faire reconnaître les besoins des Franco-Ontariennes et des Franco-Ontariens dans le domaine universitaire, et c'est un peu en fonction de cet objectif-là que je me présente devant vous aujourd'hui ;

En établissant des liens avec les associations provinciales d'enseignantes et d'enseignants de tous les niveaux ainsi qu'avec les associations provinciales et nationales qui ont pour but de promouvoir et de développer les droits des Canadiens français et des Canadiennes françaises ;

En favorisant le développement de ressources, de services et de produits culturels de langue française.

2. Promouvoir les intérêts professionnels de ses membres.

3. Fournir un lieu privilégié de réflexion concertée sur l'avenir de la société franco-ontarienne et sur le rôle de l'université dans le développement de cette société.

Les objectifs de votre comité semblent rejoindre en de nombreux points ceux de notre association, et nous sommes heureux et heureuses de pouvoir apporter une contribution au travail de votre groupe.

Je vous remercie beaucoup de votre attention.

1640

M. le Président : Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ?
Monsieur Beer.

M. Beer : Merci beaucoup, Monsieur le Président, et merci pour la présentation. Je comprends que vous êtes venu de Hearst et donc je suis content que nous pouvons vous écouter.

En parlant du niveau postsecondaire, comme vous le savez fort bien, on a maintenant la Cité collégiale à Ottawa, il y a l'étude que l'on a faite sur le niveau collégial dans le Nord et dans le Sud et on parle aussi de la question de l'université. Quel en est votre point de vue ? Est-ce que votre association a un point de vue sur la question comment on pourrait structurer une université de langue française ? Par exemple, est-ce qu'on veut avoir un centre ou est-ce que ce serait peut-être en regroupant les collèges de Hearst, Laurentienne, Ottawa... Comment est-ce que vous envisagez l'établissement d'une université pas bilingue mais de langue française ?

M. Tremblay : Bien, les idées qui mijotent présentement vont dans le sens de la création d'une université francophone homogène de langue française, mais à multiples campus dans le style d'universités qu'on connaît, par exemple, de l'Université du Québec, de l'Université de Moncton et aussi des universités qu'on connaît dans plusieurs états américains. Donc, c'est bien certain que la création d'une telle université impliquerait la présence de divers campus dans les différentes régions de la province puisqu'il faudra bien certainement desservir la

population francophone là où elle se trouve, et elle se trouve un peu dispersée dans la province.

M. Beer : Est-ce que vous avez fait la même recommandation au sujet d'un collège francophone pour le Nord, un collège communautaire avec peut-être multiples campus, ou pensez-vous que ce serait mieux d'avoir un collège quelque part dans le Nord ?

M. Tremblay : Si je réponds à cette question, je dépasse un peu le mandat de l'association que je représente.

M. Beer : A titre personnel ?

M. Tremblay : Je pense que le même principe...

M. Beer : Ça pose la même question, le même problème jusqu'à un certain point. Est-ce qu'il faut regrouper tout le monde dans un centre et est-ce que ça va répondre aux besoins communautaires, ou est-il mieux en effet d'établir quelque chose un peu différent comme les campus multiples ?

M. Tremblay : Non, très succinctement, il ne faut certainement pas essayer de regrouper tout le monde dans le même endroit parce que c'est une formule impossible. Et c'est une formule qui, peut-être surtout pour les gens du Nord comme nous, n'a pas de bon sens parce que, lorsqu'on regroupe dans certains endroits, on a tendance à regrouper dans les endroits les plus peuplés et ça veut toujours dire que le Nord se fait vider par des formules comme celles-là. Donc, très certainement, je ne pense pas qu'il y ait personne dans le Nord qui va souhaiter ce genre de solution.

Vous allez avoir la chance de faire une tournée du Nord de la province avec votre comité et je pense que ça va vous donner une bonne idée de quoi ça a l'air, le Nord. Donner des services dans une région comme celle-là, il faut être présent dans le plus grand nombre possible de communautés. Il faut inventer des institutions qui sont adaptées à ces circonstances-là.

M. le Président : Merci. Dernière question. Monsieur Bisson.

M. Bisson : Premièrement, j'aimerais vous remercier pour être venu devant notre comité pour parler d'une question qui est très importante : l'éducation postsecondaire. C'est une question à laquelle il faut répondre dans cette province de la même façon qu'au Québec pour les anglophones minoritaires. M. Beer a touché un peu au point dont je voulais parler, mais peut-être un peu plus précisément sur une idée : premièrement, comme Franco-Ontarien ici, comment vous sentez-vous envers la situation qu'en Ontario on n'a pas de programmes postsecondaires pour la minorité francophone comparé à ceux de la minorité anglophone au Québec ?

La deuxième affaire, vous avez touché un peu au point de la deuxième partie de la question que je voulais poser.

Mais l'autre affaire est, voyez-vous comme option l'utilisation d'autres installations qui sont déjà en place, ou est-ce que ça a besoin d'être une bâtisse totalement séparée

dans un endroit totalement isolé des autres campus qui sont déjà en place ?

M. Tremblay : Je vais reprendre la dernière question puis peut-être essayer de remonter à la première partie de votre question. Il me semble que l'important, et ce que nous revendiquons de plus en plus pour la communauté francophone, est la création d'institutions homogènes de langue française gérées par les francophones. Maintenant, comment est-ce que ça va se concrétiser dans la réalité ? Je pense qu'il y a plusieurs formules possibles à partir du moment où les principes sont acceptés.

Il est important de reconnaître que, surtout au niveau postsecondaire, nous avons tenté l'expérience au cours surtout des vingt dernières années, mais ça fait une trentaine d'années déjà que l'Université Laurentienne existe en tant que question bilingue, que l'Université d'Ottawa existe comme institution publique — ça fait déjà vingt-cinq ans qu'elle s'est donné un mandat bilingue très clair.

L'expérience a démontré que ce genre d'institution ne répond pas bien aux besoins des francophones, que ce sont en quelque sorte des foyers d'assimilation et à toutes fins utiles. Quand on y regarde de près, on se dit : « Bien, au fond, à quoi est-ce que ça sert d'investir de l'argent pour donner des services aux francophones dans des institutions de ce genre qui ne produisent pas les résultats souhaités ? » Donc, c'est bien certain que les principes de base, l'homogénéité linguistique des institutions homogènes de langue française gérées par les francophones, c'est une solution qui est relativement simple et parfois il m'arrive de me demander pourquoi, au niveau de la province, on a tellement de réticence à nous accorder ce genre d'institution. Parce qu'au fond, nous disons que si nous avions ce genre d'institution, nous aurions la chance de nous développer dans un milieu qui est propice au développement des francophones, dans un milieu favorable à notre épanouissement et dans un milieu où il est agréable pour nous de vivre puisque nous pourrions y vivre en français et nous instruire en français.

Donc, je pense qu'il y a tellement de bonnes raisons de mettre sur pied des institutions comme celles-là. J'essaie de trouver pourquoi on hésiterait tellement à le faire et je vous avoue que ça me laisse encore perplexe.

M. Bisson : Merci.

M. Tremblay : Je ne sais pas si j'ai répondu —

M. Bisson : Oui. Merci, C'est ce qu'on voulait entendre. Merci bien.

The Chair: Before we close, I was told that one of our speakers who is listed for this evening is here, and I do not know if she still is here and this committee wishes to hear her now. It would actually ease up some of the pressure for the evening schedule. Is Shirley O'Connor here? She may have come in and gone or she may still be here, I do not know. Shirley O'Connor? No. Okay. Then we will break until 7 o'clock this evening.

The committee recessed at 1651.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1908.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. We are happy to resume our hearings here this evening at the Timmins High and Vocational School in Timmins. This is the sixth day of our hearings. We had a full afternoon session here, and we are continuing this evening with a number of speakers as well.

JEANOT LeGRANGE

The Chair: The first person I would like to call is Jeanot LeGrange.

Mr LeGrange: I would like to begin by saying that I am a francophone. I was born in Quebec and I had to attend school in Montreal. My parents decided to move to northern Ontario, and I had to move back and forth from my parents' home to the school in Montreal, because there are no francophone deaf schools in the north. There is a great lack of services for that, so I was sent to Montreal.

I would like to see better services for the north, because it separates our families. When my brother was born—I have a deaf brother as well—he also had to go to school, and we looked at where he was going to go. Do we have to go all the way back to Quebec again, to Montreal, to go to school, to get services in French for deaf people? We have no place to learn here in northern Ontario and we need to use our own sign language, which is called langue des signes québécois. There are no services like that in the north for francophones who are deaf. Anyway, my family had to cope as best it could with both myself and my little brother. Of course, we used LSQ, which is a sign language of French. My parents were very frustrated with having to send us far away.

We have no interpreters here. We need interpreters in our community who can understand our language, who can help us in the courts and in the banks and things like that. We have no interpreter services here. It is something we would like to see established. Even if we are looking for work, how are we supposed to get proper jobs and go for job interviews without that kind of service? We need to get that service in our language, LSQ. There are anglophone deaf people here who use American sign language, but they would have a better time acquiring the services of an interpreter from the south than we would. We have no francophone LSQ interpreters, so I need you to have a sense of that. I guess that is what I want to say.

Mr Malkowski: You were born in Quebec, correct?

Mr LeGrange: Yes, I was.

Mr Malkowski: If Quebec were to opt to become independent, what would you say about that?

Mr LeGrange: I guess I would like to see Quebec remain within Canada. I would not want to see them go independent.

Mr Martin: For you the key to any success and reaching your potential in this country we call Canada is education, and education in your own language?

Mr LeGrange: That is correct. I think that is the key, having LSQ in an environment where I can learn. The francophone schools are in Quebec. There is nothing here in the north. We would like to see that developed and we would like to see resources. We need that now. We live here. This is our home. We should not have to leave to get the services.

Mr Beer: One of the things we might want to look at is that between Ontario and Quebec there is an exchange agreement, and we have in the past used that to try to bring experts, specialists, people with particular skills we do not have in this province into Ontario. It may be that one of the things we want to explore is whether the schools in Quebec that are providing the LSQ training—for example, in dentistry we have places the province takes from the French-language dental schools in Quebec so that those francophones in Ontario who want to do their dental degree in French can do that. We may want to have a look at whether we could do some reciprocal programs around LSQ, so that we would then have some interpreters in the north. You are probably the fifth person who has said, "Look, we've got a real problem around interpreters," and there may be some practical things, at least in the first instance, that we can do in making use of the schools that exist while we try to develop that capacity, perhaps at one of the community colleges in Ontario, perhaps Cité Collégiale in Ottawa, where we could actually then train our own LSQ interpreters. It is something I think we should look at.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Before calling up the next speaker, I want to do something I omitted to do before. I appreciate the brevity of the previous presentation. If we could keep the presentations to within the 20-minute mark for organizations and the 10-minute mark for individuals, it would allow us to get through the list of speakers we have this evening, plus a few others who asked this afternoon to be able to speak to us. That would help us a great deal and allow everyone who wants to speak a chance.

TIMMINS LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: I would call next Roger Ladouceur from the Timmins Labour Council. I will ask the Vice-Chair of the committee to take the chair.

Mr Ladouceur: First, I would like to welcome the committee to Timmins and thank you for this opportunity to speak. It will probably be a little different from what you have heard the rest of the day. I was not here this afternoon, but it seems to be the Quebec thing as well as the Constitution. As important as that is, and I do believe it is a very important thing, I also have other concerns on the federal level, as a similar problem labour faces. As Quebec has been important, other people have problems as well.

In our union we seem to be having problems with carriers for sick pay. They are giving our members the run-around. I think the government, the provincial as well as the federal, has to interfere and make sure these carriers

are not abusing the system. The system presently in place is one where the carriers keep writing to the person, saying: "Your claim is under review. We need more medical information." The companies are getting this medical information and holding it against these people who are sick, saying, "Well, now you're too sick to do the job you have," because the carriers keep demanding more medical information. I think this is something that has to be addressed on a provincial level as well as a federal level, to ensure that these companies and these carriers do not keep doing this.

As well, I deal with layoffs on an ongoing basis. I think there should be one rule across the country for severance pay, instead of just stopping it at 26 weeks. It should be a week for every year of service. Why should 26 weeks be the magic number when a person has worked 40 years in a plant? If we are going to act as a country, we should have one rule governing severance pay. It varies from province to province.

Anti-scab legislation should be a federal thing as well as a provincial thing. Nobody likes to go on strike, and when they do—first, the government gives you a right to belong to a union. Second, they give you the right to have a strike. Third, most important of all, they do not let you protect your job: they allow scabs to take your job. I think that should be addressed as well, plus the violence it causes on picket lines. We have had numerous killed and run over, and some of these people were not even charged, as if it is an acceptable thing in 1990 to run people over because they happen to be out on strike.

Deregulation: We have all seen what that has done to our country. Worst of all is free trade. Throughout Canada we lost 226,000 jobs. The federal government has not been able to prove that it has created one job. I think that is disgraceful in a country like Canada, a young country. Every man and woman should be entitled to have a job, and a good-paying job at that.

This Mexico free trade deal scares me, it really does, because we see what happened with free trade with the States. Imagine if we start trying to compete against Mexico, when their average wage is something like 65 cents an hour.

In legislation on plant closure, I am sure we have all heard about the layoffs and the plants that are going to Mexico for the cheaper wages. Companies have been trying to get out of even severance pay. We have snakes for employers in this province, where they close their company down, declare bankruptcy, hide the money, do not pay their people, then open up under a different name down the street. This has to stop. That is unjust to all Canadians when employers can do things like that. There are some good employers out there but there are also some bad ones.

Those were just some of the concerns I wanted to raise. I would like to thank you for this opportunity of addressing you. Any questions?

Mr F. Wilson: Definitely. I have asked similar questions of other labour and union representatives who came before us. The labour movement, with its entire organization and all the activists like yourself who are involved, and the litany of problems—it is not a complete list, I understand, you have given us this morning—what can

you see as labour's role in what we call the constitutional debate? Can you see it from an educational point of view? Can you see using the apparatus of labour education to inform people, or have you some of your own ideas?

Mr Ladouceur: One thing we have to do is look at the colleges we have already built to retrain some of these laid-off workers. I am not opposed to knitting and crocheting—I am sure that is a lot of fun—but instead of having these classes at northern colleges and universities, things like that, these should be upgrading and training laid-off workers.

I think it is time that management as well as unions—I guess they are to blame to a certain degree—sit down and work some of their problems out. We saw a problem at the Dome mine in Timmins that was just terrible. There was a strike there that did not have to be, because some people dug in their heels and did not care and are on the borderline of breaking every law in this province, and it looks like they are going to get away with it. That is the kind of attitude that creates more problem and more dissension than we presently have in this province and probably in this country.

Mr F. Wilson: I know it is difficult to look beyond those things, but I was more getting at the vast resources that are at the call of organized labour, especially in the steelworkers, with your educational apparatus. Do you see a role for that kind of apparatus, for the union movement itself, in the unity debate? Can you see them taking some kind of role other than the traditional one labour has taken?

Mr Ladouceur: I would hope so, that they would take a more active role and a more positive note.

1920

Mr Beer: I wonder if you could tell us how, to this point in time, the recession has impacted on the labour movement in this area and what your sense is of what is happening. Last week we were in a number of places, including Sault Ste Marie, and we certainly had a pretty grim picture of what might be happening further in terms of Algoma and so on. But what is the situation here, and how do you see the next six months to a year in terms of the labour situation?

Mr Ladouceur: We have had layoffs in pretty well every industry in Timmins, as well as the lumber. The gold mines up here have had about 700 layoffs in the last eight months; 300 coming from my local, another 300-and-some coming from Placer Dome, some more at Detour Lake. It has just been terrible as far as the mining industry is concerned, partly due to the recession, partly due to the price of gold, and also due to the flow-through shares, which were very popular when they first came out. I guess the abuse was there, and somebody stopped it; I will not dwell on that too much.

Mr Beer: That was a federal program, right?

Mr Ladouceur: Right. I would also like to point out that Quebec has a flow-through share program from the province itself, which—I do not want to get too deeply involved in this flow-through share—just creates so much work, it is hard for me not to feel it was a positive thing.

The problem there was the abuse of some of the companies, and instead of dealing with the companies that were abusing the system, they just took it right out. I think that was a serious mistake. Obviously, in Timmins that hurt us bad.

Mr Beer: That kind of program helps prospecting and so on, so it created—

Mr Ladouceur: Yes, new mines developing. If a new mine gets on side, you are probably looking at an extra 300 or 400 jobs. The spinoff of this 300 or 400 jobs probably creates another 400 or 500, the restaurant business and the hotel business, all over.

Mr Harnick: At the outset of your presentation, you talked about the need for federal involvement dealing with insurance, federal involvement dealing with severance, federal involvement dealing with the problem with scabs. Does labour feel we should have a stronger central federal government, or should we be reducing the powers of the federal government and giving more power to the provinces? What is labour's point of view?

Mr Ladouceur: That is a good question. I am almost contradicting myself. That is roughly what I would have to do on that question. I think the provinces should have more power, but assuming they cannot have more power is why I talked on a federal note. I would like to see the provinces have more power in this area. I think it would enhance the government's position. Whether it be Ontario or any of the provinces, I think they deserve and should have more power to deal with some of these issues, as well as the banking industry. I think the provinces should have more power.

Mr Offer: My question is somewhat taken from Mr Harnick's line of questioning. We had some presentation last week which spoke about some of the issues of labour. While addressing some of the substantive matters, such as some of the things you have brought forward—anti-scab legislation, minimum wage, plant closure—they also went on to state that it is important that the legislation, which is provincial in nature—you have just in your previous answer alluded to that—it is important that there be a standardized type of labour protection across the country. They stated not only that barriers should be reduced for interprovincial trade but also that the labour legislation, which is currently, in the main, a provincial responsibility, should be transferred to the federal government or for federal responsibility, so that whatever that legislation might be it would be common across the country, dealing with issues such as minimum wage or plant closure or severance pay and the like. I am wondering if you can share with us an observation from your standpoint as to whether this type of responsibility should remain provincial and be dealt with on a province-by-province basis or should be potentially transferred to the federal government.

Mr Ladouceur: It would be nice to get the best of both worlds. I guess that is what I was trying to allude to. You were right on if that is what you are trying to catch me on, and you are right. But I would like to have the best of all the provinces, just like we would like to have the best for our families and have the best for anybody we represent.

And if the federal government looked at the best legislation of all the provinces and put it together, I think we might be talked into it.

SERVICES À LA JEUNESSE DE HEARST

The Vice-Chair: We will next call up, from the Services à la jeunesse de Hearst, Pierre Fontaine.

M. Fontaine: J'aimerais remercier la commission de me permettre de parler au sujet de l'avenir de l'Ontario dans la Confédération. J'ai quelques questions que j'aimerais aborder, comme celle-ci : quelles valeurs partageons-nous, Canadiens français, avec les Canadiens anglais ?

Je suis venu au monde dans le nord de l'Ontario et j'ai grandi à Hearst, qui est une petite ville à majorité francophone. En grandissant, un des valeurs que je pensais que les Canadiens avaient est la tolérance envers les minorités et les nouveaux immigrants, et en vieillissant j'ai vu que c'était faux. Je sais que ce n'est pas tout le monde qui est de même mais dans les journaux et à la télévision on voit beaucoup de choses qui démontrent que les gens ne respectent pas les autres. Ils ne respectent pas les Québécois, il y a beaucoup de Québécois qui ne respectent pas les anglophones. On voit ça souvent. Ça me fait de la peine de voir ça. Le Canada a tout le temps été vu comme un pays très tolérant. Tu vas en dehors du Canada, tu vas te promener dans d'autres pays et quand tu dis que tu es Canadien ils vont te donner la lune. Mais on ne voit pas ça dans notre pays. Je ne comprends pas ça.

Le rôle que l'Ontario doit jouer dans la Confédération, je pense qu'il faut qu'elle commence à montrer du leadership au niveau de ses minorités et donner aux Franco-Ontariens les droits d'avoir leur éducation, leurs propres institutions et les laisser gérer ces institutions. Je suis sûr que si on nous donne les outils pour nous épanouir, on va le faire. Il y a beaucoup de gens qui ont les capacités de faire ça. On serait capables de le faire en ayant nos outils pour nous épanouir et on serait beaucoup plus productifs au niveau de la province. On serait peut-être moins ignorants sur certaines choses qui se passent autour de nous. On serait plus sensibles aux autres. Mais là, il faut tout le temps se battre d'un bord puis de l'autre. C'est bien beau vouloir se battre, mais il faut que de temps en temps on reçoive. On l'entend tout le temps, c'est tout le temps des batailles. Il n'y a rien de positif qui passe dans les nouvelles. Je trouve ça déplorable. Il me semble que c'est l'image qu'on donne aux jeunes et ça se reflète sur tout le monde et je pense qu'il faut changer cette image-là et commencer à dialoguer ensemble et à essayer de se comprendre.

Je trouve que le Canada anglais et le Québec ne se comprennent pas. Les Québécois ne savent pas ce qui se passe dans l'Ouest, ils ne savent pas ce qui se passe dans le nord de l'Ontario et nous, on ne sait pas plus ce qui se passe au Québec. Il y a un gros manque de communication qui se fait. Je pense que l'Ontario doit jouer un rôle important là-dedans. Il faut essayer de commencer à créer des liens. Il y en a qui sont faits mais il faut travailler plus fort là-dessus, aussi au niveau du reste du Canada.

Au niveau de l'éducation, je pense que la clé importante pour la minorité franco-ontarienne est d'avoir nos propres institutions et de gérer nos propres institutions. Il y

a déjà du beau qui a été fait mais il faut que ça continue et que ça vienne un peu plus vite. Il ne faut pas attendre un autre soixante ans avant d'avoir de nouvelles choses. Il faut que ça roule plus pour démontrer qu'on est sérieux dans nos affaires.

Une autre chose que je voudrais ajouter avant de terminer, c'est que je trouve que les gouvernements depuis les derniers quinze, même vingt ans promettent beaucoup de choses, mais un courant du pouvoir ça change tout. C'est le moment pour qu'il y ait des gouvernements qui deviennent responsables de ce qu'ils disent et pas faire des illusions aux gens : «On va faire ci, on va faire ça», puis rien ne se passe.

1930

Je pense que ça a fait que le monde n'a plus confiance dans le gouvernement. Ils n'ont plus confiance dans l'autorité parce qu'ils sont sensés — Il est temps que ça change et que le gouvernement devienne plus responsable, qu'il commence à écouter plus les gens, la masse pour savoir ce qu'ils veulent et pas faire des promesses pour paraître bien, c'est peut-être ça. C'est fini de paraître bien, il faut passer à l'action. Tout le monde fait beaucoup de promesses, ça paraît bien, mais quand vient le temps de passer à l'action, ça prend du leadership.

Si le Canada est en train de s'effondrer, je pense que c'est une des raisons. C'est pas mal tout ce que je voulais dire. Je vous remercie de m'avoir écouté.

Le Vice-Président : Vous avez un couple de questions, Monsieur Beer ?

M. Beer : Merci, Monsieur le Président.

Vous êtes ici en tant que représentant des Services de la jeunesse de Hearst. Imaginez un moment que vous étiez le bon Dieu un jour et que vous avez tous les pouvoirs pour faire certaines choses, en effet pour aider l'épanouissement de la jeunesse dans cette région de la province. On sait qu'il y a maintenant des écoles, le collège de Hearst de la Chaîne française, les services qui viennent du projet de loi 8. De quoi pensez-vous la jeunesse francophone a-t-elle besoin et qu'est-ce que vous feriez ? Que peut-on faire, disons, au niveau de la province pour vraiment aider l'épanouissement de la jeunesse francophone dans le Nord ?

M. Fontaine : Je pense qu'il faut donner les outils nécessaires à la jeunesse pour s'épanouir.

M. Beer : Comme quoi ?

M. Fontaine : Vous avez nommé le collège universitaire dans la région de Hearst. Ça en est une. Ça n'est pas toute la couche de la société, mais ça en est une partie. Juste dans une université et au collège il y a beaucoup d'activités qui sont en français au niveau de la culture. Peut-être que ça a un effet sur le restant de la population à Hearst et puis ce qui l'entoure.

On est un service de prévention primaire en français. Je ne sais pas si on est bilingue, mais la plupart des gens à Hearst sont tous des francophones, donc tous nos services ici sont en français. Si un anglophone vient, il peut participer à nos activités, mais ça c'en est une autre chose. Puisque là il y a un milieu où les jeunes peuvent vivre en français puis tout se fait en français, ça aide leur épanouissement s'ils sont capables d'avoir des renseignements sur

le SIDA en français, des choses de même. Mais il l'a dans notre service. Donner la chance aux jeunes de se rencontrer, avoir des plateformes où les jeunes pourraient se rencontrer et discuter de toutes sortes de choses, ça serait vraiment intéressant parce qu'on est éloigné de tout le monde.

Dans notre région il y a beaucoup de francophones. À Hearst, 95% de la population est francophone. Mais si on va en dehors, on a juste à aller à Kapuskasing, Timmins, ce n'est pas la même chose. On n'a pas la chance de parler avec ces gens-là souvent. On n'a pas la même conception des choses puisque on n'a jamais eu à nous battre pour nos droits tout le temps ; tout est français dans notre région. Quand je restais à Hearst, je pensais que le Canada était parfait et que tout le monde était comme nous, mais quand tu vas en dehors c'est pas la même chose, puis là c'est une claque dans la face, ça ne t'aide pas à réaliser les problèmes.

Mr Martin : Your presentation was typically refreshing coming from a young person and you had a lot of good ideas. One of them I just wanted to highlight, and it sort of follows on to something you just said there, that maybe responding to what you just talked about, that we sort of have—and we have heard this term before—two solitudes in our country. What this committee should perhaps recommend is that we declare a year of truce.

Mr Fontaine : Yes.

Mr Martin : And in that year, we could have exchange programs, like, nobody would argue or fight with anybody. That would be against the law. But people from Quebec would be encouraged to go into English Canada, people from English Canada would be encouraged to go to Quebec and the native people would be encouraged to come too and we would be encouraged to go into native communities and all the different cultures would share and we would have international festivals of food and dancing and maybe the young people could organize it all. Then after the year was up, we could talk about this subject again. What do you think?

M. Fontaine : Je pense que ce serait une bonne idée.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I really did appreciate your presentation. You obviously have a touch with a group of people that we have not heard a lot from and that is the young people of the north in particular and certainly the young francophones in Ontario. You said something about services in French. Could you just give us a little bit broader perspective of what kinds of things you do for the young people in Hearst?

M. Fontaine : On est un centre de prévention primaire, puis on essaie d'organiser des activités auprès des jeunes francophones de notre communauté pour les garder en dehors de la rue, qu'ils aillent faire des cours, tout ça. On a une Maison des jeunes, comme ça s'appelle ; c'est une maison qui est gérée par les jeunes où les jeunes organisent leurs propres activités. C'est eux qui décident de ce qu'ils veulent faire, quelles sortes d'activités ils veulent faire. Nous on est là, pas en tant que dirigeants mais juste pour voir que les choses qu'ils veulent faire sont réalistes.

Un des projets qu'on fait à la Maison des jeunes c'est qu'on offre des ateliers sur le suicide, le SIDA, d'autres choses de ce genre.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you tell me if the introduction and now full implementation of some aspects of Bill 8 have been helpful to your service, or would it have developed the same without Bill 8?

M. Fontaine: Je parle pour Hearst. C'était déjà francophone. La Loi 8 n'a pas aidé notre cause, mais je suis sûr que dans d'autres régions ça a beaucoup aidé. Mais notre service était déjà bilingue puis francophone, on offrait déjà le service.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: If I may, I just have one little final, and you get some finals, monsieur. The links you talked about, could you say a little bit about the links that you think could be created? We have already talked about the tools but you used the words "tools and links."

M. Fontaine: Okay, des outils pour le développement, je parle au niveau d'éducation, avoir des collèges francophones, une université francophone —

Mrs Y. O'Neill: No, but you said the links. I heard all of that. You said links as well with the rest of Canada.

M. Fontaine: Des liens qu'on pourrait avoir, je sais qu'il y a beaucoup d'échanges qui se font entre certaines provinces au niveau de la jeunesse. C'est plutôt le Québec; il y a bien des programmes où ils vont chercher du monde en Ontario. Moi, à Hearst, je reçois beaucoup de documents avec des programmes qui parlent de bureaux du Québec en Ontario pour emporter des Ontariens au Québec, pour vivre en français là pour deux, trois semaines pendant l'été.

Mais nous autres, je ne sais pas si on a en Ontario ce genre de programme ou même si on a un bureau de l'Ontario à Québec même. Mais je sais, au niveau de la jeunesse, que le Bureau du Québec en Ontario aide beaucoup. Ils vont donner des subventions pour des rencontres entre francophones en Ontario. En Ontario je ne sais pas si on l'a, mais avec ce qu'on voit on dirait qu'eux veulent plus l'épanouissement des francophones en Ontario comme ils donnent de l'argent. Mais je ne sais pas si on en a, ces programmes d'échanges.

1940

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes, we do care. We do, maybe more so. Merci.

Ms Churley: Because you spoke so personally, I am going to speak personally to you for a minute and put a new twist on it. You said something that struck a chord in me. I came from Newfoundland. Of course, in Quebec right now Clyde Wells is not very popular, and other places. But I grew up in Labrador and when I left home and went to Ottawa to study, I was discriminated against as a Newfoundlander because those were the days in the late 1960s when Newfoundlanders were still thought to be lesser than, particularly, Upper Canadians, English-speaking Canadians in Ontario. It was quite a shock for me, being a big fish in a small pond, as you were talking about in your town, to be treated as a lesser person.

It was so bad, and I was young and vulnerable, as we often are when we leave home, that I thought I had to lie to people about where I was from for them to like me. I did that for two years. I told people I was from England. It is interesting that I said England—not France or somewhere else but England. So here I have admitted on TV now that I lied once, but it was self-preservation.

It took me about two years of my life before I figured out that I had just got involved with some racist, awful people and that in fact there are a lot of nice people who would like me anyway. But what it did to my self-esteem and that is from somebody who spoke English and basically fitted in with the culture and what it did to my self-esteem and how difficult it was for me to come out of that and believe in myself again, and I assume that happens a lot. That is my question to you, to young francophones who go off, especially from towns where you speak your language and then have to deal with the whole English world.

M. Fontaine: Oui. Je pense que c'est un des problèmes aussi. Quand tu arrives, le nord de l'Ontario c'est des petits villages puis à Hearst il y trois, quatre gros centres, le restant c'est tout des petits villages. Il y a beaucoup de ces villages où les gens parlent rien que le français puis là tu arrives à Ottawa. Ils disent que c'est bilingue, n'importe où, tu arrives là puis c'est tout un nouveau monde. Tu n'es plus chez toi puis tu as de la misère à t'identifier avec ces gens. Je le sais. J'ai vécu ça. J'étais à Thunder Bay. Je suis resté là juste une année. Je n'étais pas capable de fonctionner là-dedans en tant que francophone.

Il y avait beaucoup d'anglophones mais il y a des fois là: «You Frenchie», puis je me suis dit que je n'ai pas besoin de vivre ça. Je suis aussi bien de retourner dans ma petite ville. C'est là que je me sens le mieux puisque en dehors de ça, si tu n'es pas avec des francophones tu ne te sens pas bien, puis c'est de même je me sentais à Thunder Bay. Je ne me sentais pas chez nous, je ne me sentais même pas dans mon pays. C'est juste à six heures d'auto de ma petite ville mais c'était complètement différent puis j'ai eu de la misère à fonctionner dans ce système-là. C'est aussi simple que ça.

Le Vice-Président: Merci beaucoup, Monsieur Fontaine.

M. Fontaine: Merci.

The Vice-Chair: Liliane Laforest? From the Kapuskasing Labour Council, Enzo Altobelli?

DAVID WALLBRIDGE

The Vice-Chair: All right, then we will go to David Wallbridge. Mr Wallbridge, you will have 10 minutes in case you have not been told. We have allowed more time.

Mr Wallbridge: I do not think I will be that long. I am not sure I will be able to impart much wisdom to the committee this evening, except that I have some experience living in Quebec. I have just finished a law program at McGill University and have had occasion to make some observations as to what I think the situation is there and what I think that this committee might appreciate in terms of a future negotiating position for this province with the

people of Quebec, or perhaps a better way of putting it, with the government.

Obviously the cultural question in Quebec is the most important question, and I suppose as Canadians a lot of people share sympathy for the question of cultural survival. The real question, I think, in most people's minds in Canada is how is this best achieved.

In the coming months, and I suppose to some extent this evening, we have had allusions to divisions of power and which government should do this or do that, but what we are really speaking about is a turf battle between bureaucracies. I think this is why a number of people are sort of alienated from the debate, because really we are talking about governments that are interested in maintaining a certain amount of power for themselves, and the people really are interested, as we have seen today, in everyday subjects: jobs, the economy, things like this.

But having said that, why is this question important to Quebec? Why is this division-of-power question important to Quebec? I think it is because the role of government in Quebec is historically different than the role of government in Ontario. I do not mean to say it is less important in Ontario, but I just think it is different, because the government in Quebec has long been an instrument of policy in terms of cultural preservation.

That is why, for them, their size of government in relation to the federal government is really important. They are interested in keeping their educated people, their French-speaking people within the confines of their province because they see it as the best way to preserve their culture, the reason being that there is a popular mythology—and it is grounded in some fact—that when people leave the province, they are subject to greater pressures of assimilation.

J'aimerais faire allusion brièvement aux commentaires faits par mon ami de Hearst. Il a mentionné que lorsqu'il sort de chez lui, il se trouve dans une situation où il se sent mal à l'aise parce qu'il ne peut pas fonctionner au niveau quotidien auquel il est habitué.

In a nutshell, my friend has alluded to the problem of Quebec within Canada. We worry about allegiances in Canada a lot, and that is because, I think, we still perceive ourselves perhaps as a melting pot in the sense that we feel that Quebec's allegiance first and foremost to itself or the people of Quebec to its province is a dangerous thing. Maybe it is a matter of degree, maybe it is not such a dangerous thing and maybe it is not something that we cannot understand, given what my friend has just said: that is to say, the people there feel most comfortable there because they can speak in French and they can function in French and that is a pleasure for them. When they leave Quebec, it is not as easy to function in French. As a matter of fact, we well know that although we do have a certain Utopian vision of Canada as a bilingual country, in effect there are many areas in this country where people cannot function in French.

So when we get worried about allegiances and everybody should be Canadian first, maybe we should be Canadian first, but maybe we should understand that there is a sort of dual allegiance, and for very concrete reasons. How would we feel in Ontario if we were the only English-

speaking province and we were surrounded by a sea of French-speaking people? We would feel a great allegiance to Ontario, and I would suggest then perhaps to the rest of Canada. Again I am speaking in matters of degree.

The danger in that, I believe, is that this can be used as an instrument or perhaps as an excuse for good government. Having said that Quebec is a little different than Ontario and that its relationship to its people as government is different, what I think we are dealing with these days is perhaps the wrong shade of the right thing. We have a government which has a legitimate role in the protection of its people. But after a certain extent, it is my submission, and this is based on my experience in Quebec, that it has become an excuse for good government, and to some extent it is no coincidence that often these debates are raised around election time.

1950

That sounds perhaps cynical but there is some truth to it. Having said that, what position should Ontario be taking? In my submission, we should not be overly concerned about the status quo any more. I think what we should be doing is sitting down and asking ourselves, fine, what can the provinces do and what can the federal government do? But if Quebec takes a different position, we should just be bearing in mind that its relationship to its people and the role that that government must play is different than that of Ontario and it is different than the rest of Canada.

I just think that what needs to be addressed is the problem with some degree of intellectual honesty. If we have a problem in Canada or Quebec vis-à-vis cultural survival, well, let's deal with it. Let's not pretend that all the provinces have to be the same. If we have a particular problem, let's deal with the problem and let's not let the politicians, in Ontario or in Quebec, run away with some rhetorical flourishes about what is provincial or federal. Let's deal with the problem as it is and avoid the risks of intellectual dishonesty that plagued the last process.

I think people were generally interested in consensus in Canada. But I think the way that the process unravelled and why it unravelled was because we were given these concepts, distinct society and so on, and people did not really know what that was about. I think what bothered people really was that the governments were not giving them enough credit for their own intelligence. People really wanted to feel that they were going to be consulted and treated fairly, and I think part of what went wrong with the process is that we were not presented with the problems honestly. Those are my submissions.

Ms Churley: You mentioned that we have to look at this problem realistically, and I agree with you on that. I mean we cannot be playing games around it. I am curious, though, as to what you would say about the problem for instance in 1982 when Trudeau brought the Constitution home, left the aboriginal peoples out then and said, "Oh, we will have a conference." Again with Meech there is, "We will deal with it later," and the same thing with women.

Beyond the process there were some real serious problems in terms of leaving people out who should have been

in, and I am curious as to what you have to say about that in the present process; also how you feel about what kinds of things you would be willing to see in terms of the kind of social programs and the kinds of equality that have been so hard fought for that could be lost if we do not do this carefully. I know that is a big question but—

Mr Wallbridge: Yes. I will try to address it as best I can. You know it is really a hard thing to look back sometimes at, without getting into historical revisions. You can say, "Well, if you had done this in 1982," or "If this had been done then," and to some extent I perhaps am guilty of that as well. What lessons can we learn from that? I think that any time you go to a public forum you will have, as we have seen today, a number of interest groups who would like to have their point of view addressed.

The problem with the Quebec question is that it may be very difficult to do that. In a sense we almost have to acknowledge the primacy of that particular problem. That is one of the reasons that the amending problem in the Constitution has been a problem. It is because so many people have so many legitimate concerns, all of which are legitimate, that they feel usurped to some extent when someone else's problem is addressed first. But maybe this is such a delicate problem that we are going to have to trust ourselves to deal with it in some kind of a sequence is what I am getting at.

As to legitimate concerns about equality issues, I think that the people are concerned about that. They are concerned about terms like "distinct society." They are concerned about social justice across the country. The people have the political will—

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to wrap up. We are running out of time.

Mr Wallbridge: That is all I had to say.

Ms Churley: Maybe we can talk later.

ABORIGINAL URBAN ALLIANCE

The Vice-Chair: We next call the Aboriginal Urban Alliance of Ontario, represented by Andy Rickard.

Again, we would remind people that we are giving organizations tonight 20 minutes to make presentations and individuals 10 minutes, so that we have as much time as possible to be able to allow as many presentations as possible in the short time that we have. Mr Rickard, if you are ready?

Mr Rickard: [Remarks in Cree]

Ladies and gentlemen of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, we are pleased to make this presentation this evening. My initial welcoming remarks were conducted in my own language to demonstrate to you that French and English languages in this country are not the only languages what we know.

It is a historical fact that my own aboriginal language was the main language used before any Europeans came here. The reason that we wanted you to hear the language was to demonstrate to you how our forefathers felt when your ancestors first spoke to them in their European language, and I am not being facetious saying that. These are facts, and I think we have to share historical facts together.

If you bear with me, I might take a little longer than 20 minutes to explain this, so I would ask you to give me an extra minute or two.

First of all, I wish to explain our group which we are representing this particular evening. We recently formed our organization that we call the Aboriginal Urban Alliance, which we formally established on 29 December 1990, to represent our unique aspirations and concerns as treaty status aboriginal people living off our reserves in Ontario. For your own information, there are over 50,000 people that we can categorize as urban aboriginal people, and I am giving you the background information which will provide you with the description of who we are and what our organization is all about.

2000

I am sorry. I am paraphrasing this presentation. I hope you do not mind. It might shorten the presentation.

We are not presently being represented by our own band council while we are off our reserves, nor by our tribal councils, nor by any existing political association in this country, nor by a friendship centre nor by a Metis non-status group. In fact, the Assembly of First Nations, our national organization, does not even represent any aspect of our concerns and special aspirations and needs.

Consider the following status of our situation:

Between 40% and 50% of our people live in mainstream society throughout Ontario, sometimes without a choice because back in our reserves we lack the employment and educational opportunities.

Many of our people work, many of us own our own houses through long-term mortgage commitments and arrangements and, yes, practically all of us pay property, school and provincial sales taxes as well as the GST and any other tax that the general public now pays throughout the country.

We even dare claim that our contribution in the tax system far outweighs all the benefits that our people have been receiving since Confederation. You probably never hear that because we are busy working out there and we have not got time to enter into any bickering contest with anybody.

Many of us continue to pursue our academic education goals to demonstrate to ourselves that we are very capable of achieving higher forms of education and professional status in mainstream Canada.

It could be said that we are almost a forgotten people. We have no representation in discussions and negotiations with governments concerning aboriginal, treaty and constitutional rights, even though we pay full taxes as citizens of this country. It might look like we are coming to a Boston tea party aboriginal-style one of these days.

Although we live off our lands, we have never given up our special status as aboriginal people, in terms of our treaty, our constitutional recognition that we have as original people.

As our background information indicates, we have decided to form our own organization to represent our concerns because we are certain that no one will speak for us if we do not act on our own now. Therefore, it is imperative that we stand up because we are not only speaking for

our own treaty and aboriginal rights, but we are also very concerned about speaking for our constitutional rights that are often referred to under sections 91(24) and 35 of the Canadian Constitution.

For example, section 91(24) clearly established that "Indians and lands belonging to Indians" are the federal responsibility. Just recently section 35 further recognized the Indian Metis and Inuit people as "the aboriginal peoples of Canada." The Constitution of Canada does not provide in there any restrictions to indicate that we have to live on our reserves to enjoy our special constitutional status.

Although these constitutional inequities exist today, we are not going to deal with them right now because we are pursuing other legal forums and processes to eradicate the situation. This introduction was intended to provide you with some awareness as to why we have organized ourselves in the way I just described.

As aboriginal taxpayers, we are very concerned about the socioeconomic and political instability of this country. While many of our own aboriginal political organizations rarely provide any directional positions or creative ideas on Canadian unity, we are often very quick to react on issues rather than to proact with substantive solutions. It may be that we are so busy just surviving, maintaining our bread and butter issues, which restricts us from taking active part in the deliberations and the debate of national unity in this country. In spite of our lack of participation on substance matters, we believe that the success in dealing with the aboriginal issues will dictate just exactly how unified and strong Canada can become in the 20th century or 21st century, because unless we have an economically strong and stable country, it is very difficult to deal with the various socioeconomic issues facing our people across this country.

I would like to now make a presentation to this committee. I will attempt to address the questions on specific areas in an enumerated form as outlined in your discussion paper entitled *Changing for the Better: An Invitation to Talk About A New Canada*. At the conclusion of my presentation, I will provide you with our recommendations.

The first question you have framed in your discussion paper: What are the values we share as Canadians? It is true that Canada is a diverse country with a non-revolutionary tradition and it can be claimed that it has two of the world's great languages, French and English. However, the population of this country can also be categorized as one third English, one third French and the other third possessing neither English or French as its mother tongue.

Further, the notion of two founding nations, English and French, is a historical misconception which is dividing the heart and soul of this country. Moreover, historically we know as aboriginal people that no nation of people found this country, because this country was never lost, to our knowledge. Rather, the so-called early European explorers were the ones who accidentally stumbled upon our country. They were lost. Period. This historical milestone has created insurmountable crises for us and very severe problems have also emanated from this particular phenomenon. If you look through the historical development of this country, we came very close to extinction. Consequently,

in order to answer this question, we have to go beyond the unfair categorization and ill-conceived definition of two founding nations. All Canadians of different backgrounds must play a major and significant role in determining the constitutional outcome of our country under a well-formulated, regionally based federation with a strong central government.

The second question you have framed: How can we secure our future in the international economy? We cannot escape the substantive demands of a global economy in the marketplace without a competitive edge. In order to achieve a competitive edge, we believe we need an adjustment of our constitutional framework under a strong central government, with equitable powers and setup of the provincial and territorial governments with special recognition for aboriginal governments. In order to be competitive in a global marketplace, we say to you that we not only have to be unified as a direct participant, but above all we have to take part as a strong, sovereign country. In order to be a strong, sovereign country, we have to get our act together in this country.

Third: What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? These are very provocative questions. The federal government must play, in our opinion, a very strong, central role under a federation of Canada. The provincial government must also be supported to enjoy equal powers within a Constitution of Canada. While Quebec is a distinct society with its own special status by virtue of its culture, language and civil law, it should be supported to retain these historical rights. Since Quebec also enjoys language protection under the Official Languages Act, this and other distinct characteristics mentioned previously more than adequately, in our opinion, recognize Quebec as having a special status under its often referred to distinct society within its own province.

2010

Furthermore, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms adequately and legally protects the English and French languages in all federal institutions in all regions of Canada where numbers warrant. Therefore, any additional special status arrangements which other provincial and territorial governments do not personally enjoy must not be granted to Quebec, in our opinion. If Quebec decides to leave Canada because English Canada—and again, a gross misinterpretation, because one third of this country is made up, as I said earlier, without French or English as its mother tongue—does not, as I say, understand or support its desire to achieve a sovereignty association type of status, then the sacrifice and concession of Canada and other provinces, territories and aboriginal governments will be too great a price to pay.

One province cannot be granted extra powers over others, even though it may represent 25% of the country's population. At best, Quebec must not be given any more special concessions. At worst, if Quebec insists on securing its desired 22 jurisdictional areas, as indicated by the Quebec Liberal Party's recent Allaire report, that it wants from Canada, then there may be no other choice but to let Quebec leave Canada's Confederation, as it indicates it will. But the bottom line must be very, very clear as well:

Quebec has to recognize that it must share 25% of the national debt, along with the other plus sides of the assets and liabilities equation.

Fourth question: How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal people? This is where I get excited. My blood pressure goes up when I read that kind of question.

We do not want to dwell on rhetorical assumptions, nor are we proud of the statistics which have relegated our people into Third World type of living conditions in such a first-class country as Canada. We do not even want to spend too much time in explaining how we have to live through racism in this country, which once was our very own. Even though it hurts and it is maddening as hell to acknowledge these historical strategies and present day inequities, it is imperative that our people play a major role in the stabilization and restructuring of this country.

Canada and the provinces must invite our first nations to the discussions and negotiations at the first ministers' forums, including direct, bilateral dialogue with Canada on matters of federal-aboriginal significance. Moreover, provincial governments must make serious efforts with a political will to discuss and plan joint strategies in dealing with matters of provincial and aboriginal domain. While long-term constitutional solutions will be required to deal with our outstanding issues, more immediate legislative actions will also be necessary to eradicate those matters that must be resolved now. These action plans must begin immediately.

Finally, these plans must not be left to bureaucrats who may rarely leave their secure offices in Toronto and the Ottawa-Hull area. These issues are far too important for white bureaucrats to screw up again. I am sorry for being blunt, but that is just an expression of how our people are frustrated across this country. I am just a mirror reflecting these frustrations.

Aboriginal issues are about aboriginal people. We have to be involved. We must be involved in dealing with them right from the start, from the definition of the problem to the identification of a resolution process to the actual implementation of action plans to deal with it.

It is fine for Ontario to indicate its support for aboriginal self-government; however, a general support statement without a clearly defined substantive policy and without an adequate financial resourcing base is meaningless and it could give false hope to the first nations of this province. Therefore, Ontario must quickly move to provide more substance and financial resourcing in its support of aboriginal self-government development in this province.

The fifth question: What are the roles of the English and French languages in this Canada? What about the other languages? Why did you not ask that? German, Ukrainian, Japanese, Italian—what about them? We support the right of any nation of people to retain and maintain their own language and culture. This is a God-given right of any nation. Quebec already has constitutional and legislative protection of its language, along with its English counterpart. No other languages in this country enjoy legal protection, although the mother tongue of one third of the population, as I indicated, is neither English nor French. So what gives Quebec and English Canada the right to continue maintaining that there will be only two

official languages in this country? This question must be answered properly if we are to succeed in unifying this country. Therefore, the roles of the English and French languages need to be drastically changed—notice I said “roles”; I did not say “rules”—to reflect and accommodate the multicultural fabric of this country. That has to be the agenda, ladies and gentlemen.

The Vice-Chair: Mr Rickard, we are going to give you another couple of minutes. You had asked for a bit. We are running a little bit ahead of schedule, so we will allow you a few more minutes to wrap up.

Mr Rickard: Thank you.

Your sixth question: What is Quebec's future in Canada? Ever since the battle of the Plains of Abraham, the French and the English have had their special and distinct presence in Canada. However, my own people, the aboriginal people, have had a more distinct presence in this country long before the arrival of Cartier, Champlain and others by boat in extremely poor sanitation conditions, as pointed out by my brother Bill Wilson of British Columbia, although his description was more colourful than I am acknowledging it. I do not know if some of you saw the program, but you should watch it. From this context, “What is the aboriginal people's future in Canada?” is also a very legitimate question to ask, along with the question of what Quebec is all about.

What about Ontario's future? The Prairie provinces? The Maritime regions? Northern Canada? We are of the view that Quebec has received enough concessions from Canada with which it can enjoy a legally protected language and culture. Complement this with its own civil law and veto powers, you have a distinct province with more than adequate powers to enjoy economic, social and political stability.

Now, compare the situation of Quebec's special status in Canada with that of our own aboriginal people's plight. You will clearly see how the aboriginal people have our own diametrically opposite distinct status, a distinct status as poverty stricken people with an extremely deplorable quality of life, which in many cases can be equally compared to the worst Third World socioeconomic conditions.

As far as we are concerned, Quebec already enjoys its local autonomy with a good standard of living. Moreover, Quebec will continue to enjoy a sound economic future because it can actively participate in a global marketplace from its present decentralized constitutional power base.

The seventh question which you ask in your discussion paper: What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region? In response to these diverse demographic, economic, social and political characteristics, the regional requirements of Canada must provide equal, decentralized constitutional powers which will enhance and support solid, regionally based governing systems. This sharing of constitutional powers must be equitably divided between Canada and all the provinces and territories and, yes, aboriginal self-government must also be a major part of this process.

We say to you, ladies and gentlemen, by virtue of Quebec's additional powers, which are derived historically, it

may not be immediately possible for all other provinces and territories to enjoy the same constitutional privileges now. However, through ongoing constitutional deliberations, it will be possible for all players to achieve maximum and equitable constitutional powers, to govern Canada as a strong, federated country. However, in order to achieve a well-balanced federated governing system in Canada, we need bold leadership visionaries. Take note, bold leadership visionaries: We need a strong central government. We need leadership. There is no leadership in this country—until the last election, of course, Mr Chairman.

2020

The Vice-Chair: We are impartial on that question. I am going to ask you to wrap up in about two minutes. We gave you extra time five minutes ago and that will bring you up in about two minutes. Okay? Thank you.

Mr Rickard: When we talk about leadership, we are not talking about people like Mulroney and the Conservatives in Ottawa, who are in fact marching to the drum of George Bush. In fact, the way things are going right now, Mulroney will be known as the first vice-president who ever came from Canada. Anyway, that is supposed to be humour.

The biggest challenge, I think, facing us today is to have the ability to listen, mediate, co-operate, compromise and, above all, to act in the best interests of all Canadians, including the aboriginal people. You see, we aboriginal people are not trying to divide the country; we are trying to join federation. We are trying to complete a circle to make this country a strong constitutional circle, complete and strong.

How much time did you say I have, sir?

The Vice-Chair: You have one minute.

Mr Rickard: I cannot even explain that in one minute, what I want to give you.

The Vice-Chair: I realize. Unfortunately, we are constrained to time. We have allowed you another five minutes and we are going to have to ask you to wrap it up in about another minute.

Mr Rickard: That is going to be very difficult.

The Vice-Chair: I realize.

Mr Rickard: The eighth question: What does Ontario want? Ontario is an English version of Quebec. It enjoys the industrial heartland of Canada, a large population, a financial centre, the English language, political and economic influence, including significant constitutional veto powers. Canada has been good for Ontario. Therefore, Ontario has everything it requires to prosper economically and socially. It has the capacity to provide leadership in search of a more unified Canada. It has the multicultural diversity to address and advance the concerns and aspirations of these Canadians whose mother tongue is neither French nor English. Therefore, Ontario has all the fundamental elements to provide economic and political leadership in negotiating with Quebec and other provinces and territories to remain together in a strong federated country.

The Vice-Chair: Okay, I would like to thank you very much. I realize that we are cutting a little bit short at the

end, but we have allowed an extra five minutes to go over. We have your brief and it certainly is something that we are going to be reading; not just something we will be looking at, but something we will be looking at very seriously. On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank you.

Mr Rickard: Before you close the book on me, I want to challenge you on something. You have to hear my recommendations.

The Vice-Chair: Yes.

Mr Rickard: If you do not hear my recommendations, it was pointless for me to even talk to you or even visit you in this nice auditorium. So I want your extraordinary legislative decisions here to give me 10 more minutes to make my recommendations.

The Vice-Chair: One moment. I am going to have to ask the permission of the committee at this point.

Mr Rickard: If you came to my tepee, you would be welcome. I would not give you any time constraints to explain yourself.

The Vice-Chair: I realize that.

Mr Rickard: I ask for the same courtesy.

The Vice-Chair: I realize that, Mr Rickard. The unfortunate thing is that we are tied up by time constraints, but if it is the will of the committee—I will ask the committee—we will extend—

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could we begin on page 19 with the recommendations?

The Vice-Chair: Yes. Can we ask you to go to recommendations. We will give you an additional five minutes and that is all we can allow you, unfortunately.

Mr Rickard: Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: You are quite welcome.

Mr Rickard: We have some status quo recommendations, as well as very bold and radical recommendations. If I do not get a chance to explain all of them, you have copies of my proposal.

The Vice-Chair: That is right.

Mr Rickard: I am also going to chase you to Toronto on the 28th of this month. I will complete my presentation there and I will refuse to leave there, because there is a lot of publicity there. It is the centre of the country. Okay.

We recommend that Canada uphold the rights of the provinces, the territories and aboriginal peoples as provided in our Constitution already, because Canada can exclusively maintain and control its own domestic institutions in accordance with a governing role of Canada in the Constitution. I am just going to paraphrase some of these recommendations.

Canada must maintain the perpetuity of the federal union of provinces as implied in the Canadian Constitution, because there are no express or implied provisions for a termination of the federal union contained in the Constitution, the separation of any province or territory from the federal union, as a federal Parliament represents all of the provinces and territories. The audience may not know what I am talking about, but you have to get a copy of what I am saying. There is every semblance of logic to this

presentation. Anyway, I am skipping over a number of these things.

Notwithstanding the above, we recommend that any constitutional change in the distribution of powers between the federal government, provinces and territories and aboriginal governments must, as a minimum, have a minimum of a guarantee of the rights and freedoms of all Canadians on an equal basis; guarantee of aboriginal and treaty rights, including the constitutional entrenchment of aboriginal self-government; equal participation of aboriginal people in all future first ministers' conferences that directly and indirectly affect them; guarantee the citizens the right to use the language of their choice, as well as the freedom to practise their own ancestral culture; facilitate a working Canadian economic union, including a central bank and one currency for this country; maintain the federal government as solely responsible for the armed forces and defence and no province should be given the right to call in armed forces to settle its own domestic affairs; maintain the federal government as the sole custodian of the Taxation Act—God help us—and basic responsibilities for a central immigration regime; maintain the declaratory and disallowance powers of the federal government which are contained in the Constitution; maintain the supremacy of the federal Parliament, and maintain the Supreme Court of Canada as the highest court in the nation.

I have several others and it will take me another 15 minutes to do that, but I will conclude by thanking you for the opportunity to hear me and I hope that once your report is completed, you will give us copies of it—

The Vice-Chair: We will.

Mr Rickard: —and that we have a chance to further dialogue as to the implementation of these recommendations.

The Vice-Chair: I would like to thank you very much, Mr Rickard.

Mr Rickard: I am glad that you do not ask any questions.

The Vice-Chair: Unfortunately, no. We had a few extra minutes in the bank and unfortunately we are now at the point where we have to go on to our next presenter.

Mr Rickard: I will see you in Toronto on 28 February.

The Vice-Chair: Yes. We will be there.

2030

SHIRLEY O'CONNOR

The Chair: We would like next to call Shirley O'Connor. I am going to have to be tight with my time lines at this time. We will have 10 minutes and we will go on to our next presenter from there.

Mrs O'Connor: [Remarks in native language]

I commend the Premier of Ontario and you, the select committee, on your efforts to make a better Canada. Giving recognition to the fact all citizens play an integral part in shaping this country you call Canada is a positive step. However, there are no written laws on how this can be achieved. That is from the perspective of I see, I hear, I understand. That law is showing by example. It is with that

understanding that I am pleased to share my views and I thank you for allowing me to participate.

This presentation will touch on government structures and what they have done, such as first nations' laws, the Constitution, the Indian Act, changing for the better and why this may fail. However, in 10 minutes it is not possible for me to touch on all of those topics that I wish to share with you.

By way of introduction, my presentation is from the perspective of woman, and as a first nation of this land. I want to point out that while I am making an individual presentation, it is by no means singular in the views I am about to share. I come before you with life's experiences and the teachings of my ancestors and how I have come to understand them.

There is a purpose in sharing this with you. My only request is that you keep an open mind and I hope that I can paint for you a picture of why these issues and principles must be recognized. Only time will show me if I was successful in doing this.

Let me begin by telling you who I am. My Christian name is Shirley O'Connor. I am an Ojibway from the Nishnawbe nation, born on this land you call Ontario, in a place now known as Lac Seul. My great-grandfather migrated from the James Bay coast. My great-uncles became employees of Indian agents as translators, assisting in the signing of the treaties, Hudson's Bay clerks, labourers in building the railway. One of them later became chief.

The Indian Act, the residential schools and various religious denominations were governing our lives. Fur trading, timber cutting and commercial fishing became our source of financial survival.

In the 1970s native organizations were established to have a collective voice for the first nations of this country, in which I played a part until last year.

Generally, first nations peoples felt an attachment to Canada despite the injustices that were imposed upon us. Then there was Oka. Suddenly our eyes were opened to the false security we were attaching ourselves to, when an army moves in and starts physically abusing women and children, not to mention an elder who was stoned and later died as a result. No mention was made, no charges were laid. The only thing that was capitalized upon was the shooting death of a white policeman. The physical abuse of first nations was once again downplayed by the media.

And now the war in the Gulf and Canada's participation in it. This certainly gives you a different perspective of what Canada is, or is becoming.

As first nations, we have always clearly understood white supremacy. The premise that whites are superior to coloured must change in order to be able to live in harmony with one another. Our laws tell us there are four colours of people on this earth. Each deserve the right to live in a hassle-free environment, to live in harmony in their own lands.

There are four basic principles of kindness, sharing, honesty and strength. The teachings tell us we must show kindness and respect at all times. We must share our resources, the very basics that we depend upon for our survival. It was those basics that we shared to the first settlers

of this land. These resources are our land, trees, clean air, water, fish, animals, and we know what is happening to all of these resources today.

Honesty, truth in life is a fundamental requirement in order to live the good life as in the teaching of the circle of life. This unwritten law has been violated since the coming of the early settlers,

Strength in your spirituality. Applying these basic principles in your everyday living is the very source of one's foundation. The spirit within is proud, stands tall, knows no fear. Persons with this spirituality within are proud of who they are.

I want to talk to you about a system and what it has done to that spirituality. The various religious denominations that operated the residential schools are the single, worst perpetrators to human dignity. Every law that governed the first nations of this land was violated by that one system alone. Children were forcibly removed from families. Violence was introduced into their young lives. Fear was placed in a child's life that was once loving and care-free. Their sexuality was tampered with. Some of them—their sexuality was violated, some of them long before they reached the age of puberty. The opposite sex was now tainted, to be dirty, yet same-sex relationships were practised on chosen ones. The damage this has caused our people I could never begin to describe to you in the limited time that you have given me to give this presentation.

Equally damaging is the Indian Act. This legislation openly discriminated against women, the very people that produce life, the very people that are caretakers. It was not until women challenged the Supreme Court that the discriminatory section was removed. However, section 12-1(b) in the Indian Act is now replaced with Bill C-31, which is yet another dangerous piece of legislation that is going to further undermine the status of our people. Assimilation is still very much in the minds of government. It is no wonder that women have a far greater mistrust of this government.

A study that was done by the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women confirms my last statement of women mistrusting. They point out that, by and large, the decision-makers have been white, middle-aged, middle-class men with no direct experience of the disadvantaged. These groups should put their efforts into the democratic system and trying to change conditions through political means. They ask, "How real is Canada's commitment to equality for women?" I ask the same question with respect to first nations. Only time will tell where the political will stands on these issues.

2040

This is not to disregard the efforts that are being made to right the wrongs that have been made in Canada; they are good beginnings. However, there is much more work to be done by the politicians.

Let me share with you an experience I recently shared with my colleagues. To commemorate the 42nd anniversary of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Ontario Human Rights Commission embarked upon an ambitious program which proved to be a most exhilarating experience and provided much food for thought. Initiated and co-ordinated by Toni Silberman,

who is responsible for public affairs for the commission, the program involved our commissioners participating in and delivering words of welcome during International Human Rights Week to some 2,300 new Canadians during 24 Court of Canadian Citizenship swearing-in ceremonies which took place throughout the province of Ontario.

We were able to not only offer the new Canadians words of welcome and thanks, but to assure them as well of the rights and responsibilities that accrue to them, having chosen Ontario as their new home. Many of them escaped oppressive regimes and were grateful to find a new opportunity and a new life in Canada. Our presence at these ceremonies underscored the dissimilarity and made it even more meaningful. The new citizens were able to recognize that the objectives and the aims of the Ontario Human Rights Commission correspond with their desire to build a new life in a country where they can use their abilities, free of intolerance.

The program heralded a good start to a lofty idea, and one which we, the commission and I, believe to be essential on a continuing basis for mutual support, benefit and appreciation.

Perhaps some day we could celebrate together if Canada were able to give back to the first nations of this land their pride and dignity. This gesture is long overdue. Politicians need to take a proactive approach on issues of concern that have been raised in the respective constituencies they represent. They are numerous, I am sure. Each concern raised is of high priority from the individual or group it comes from. How they get dealt with depends upon the level of knowledge or commitment when it arrives in the political arena awaiting decision, and that is how the subject matter gets dealt with.

Your discussion paper touched on that Canada may be at the crossroads. I say Canada is truly at the crossroads of change. It is due time first nations are allowed equal partnership in the decision-making process. Do not forget we were here first, so the premise that the white man knows best what is good for this country is no longer. As the original caretakers of this land, we understand the natural resources, the environment, the animal life, and most of all, our people.

By way of concluding, I want to say that I hope all of you understand where I was coming from when I said this. I too reviewed your discussion paper. As I was going through it, I was not even halfway through when I had 15 pages of notes, only notes, about what I was prepared to respond to this committee based on discussions you have raised. I know and I realize the limitations you are putting on us, which is why I made the decision to bring this message to you in the manner I have. When a woman is in labour, you do not tell that child it has 10 minutes to come into this world. No doctor or no expectant mother can do that.

The teachings I talked about are from the basis of respect. The Constitution as it is designed, the Indian Act as it is designed, the policies that govern Canada, the policies that govern the provinces—nowhere in those policies does it show me respect for people, respect for land, respect for animal life, respect for water and air, which is why I

touched on the topic of the natural resources in Canada and what is happening to them. I only hope I have sent my message home, and when I talk about first nations as equal partners in the decision-making process.

The purpose of highlighting some of the things I did and in the manner I have presented is purely because I too have been around in the political arena, in the native organizations I talked about in the 1970s. I know and I see what the policies are doing, and the reason I presented it this way is that I wanted to share this with you. I guess the last speaker who was abruptly cut off is already an example that you have not heard my message. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: I would like to thank you. I want to say that we appreciate the presentation you made. It is quite evident to this committee and to myself that it came from the heart, and it is obvious you lived the experience and are able to share that with us. The unfortunate reality is that we are confined to time lines, because the committee has only a certain amount of time to hear many speakers. I allowed the previous speaker to go an extra 10 minutes, as well as yourself another five or seven minutes in trying to accommodate that. I would like to thank you.

Mrs O'Connor: Thank you.

2050

MUSHKEGOWUK COUNCIL

The Vice-Chair: I would like to call up the next speaker, Alex Spence from the Mushkegowuk Council. Just so we understand each other from the beginning: 20 minutes.

Mr Spence: I bring you greetings from our chiefs of the Mushkegowuk first nations, the communities of Weenusk, Attawapiskat, Kashechewan, Fort Albany, Moose Factory, Moccreebec and New Post. I would feel more comfortable speaking to you in my own language, but as the committee is not equipped to accommodate translation in our language, I will address you in English.

When the Premier visited James Bay, he learned first hand the burden our citizens face in their dealings with government officials who do not respect their language, but you are the new government so we prefer to start on a positive note.

I feel very comfortable in this building and also within the city of Timmins. Since 1986, the Timmins Board of Education has made a determined effort to work closely with us to meet the needs of our high school students. Today, we employ a counselling unit with a staff of five right in this building, and as of last month a Cree language teacher was hired to teach a full-credit course within the Cree language.

It makes me think back to my high school days in Kapuskasing. My brothers and I lived with a family whose first language was French. Since we were learning English, they agreed to a fair compromise. At mealtimes, they would speak English to help us learn the dominant language. When their friends came to visit they spoke their first language, and when our friends came to visit we spoke with them in our first language. Both situations

show how reasonable people can live together in harmony and balance.

What is our place in Ontario and the Confederation? What are our social and economic aspirations, and how can Confederation help us make this happen?

As I stand here, I think of what it would be like to sit on a chair with only two legs. You would be very uncomfortable. You would have quite a balancing act, to the point where you would probably fall over. For us, Confederation is a chair with two legs. One is the relationship between the French and English, the so-called—but not by us—founding races. The relationship is the sharing of powers between the federal government and the province. The oldest relationship of all, between aboriginal people and the newcomers, was thrown away. You keep having summers of protest and confrontations or people like Elijah Harper reminding you that something is wrong. Can you see that the leg is missing?

We were never invited to be a part of Confederation. After 1867, three commissioners came to James Bay. It was 1905, and they brought a piece of paper called Treaty 9. For more than two centuries we have celebrated peace and friendship with your ancestors using our protocol of gift-giving, feasts, speeches and your symbol of the Union Jack. When the ritual was over, the commissioners went away with our grandfathers' signatures on the paper. At Fort Albany, our elders tell us that the commissioners held the pen and told our grandfathers to touch the top of the pencil. It was nothing new for them, because the Hudson's Bay Co always wrote something in a book when giving them food or supplies. They could not read, and they had no legal means of justifying what they are doing, simply because at that time we did not have any lawyers.

Legal experts have told our generations what was going on. In the government's eyes, our ancestors had a legal burden, known as aboriginal title, which prevented them from asserting ownership and control over the land—nation-building to you. Of course, you cannot take away someone's rights without their informed consent. For us to surrender our land would be like taking away the topsoil: nothing would grow and we would not be able to survive as we once did, in harmony, for thousands of years.

We have declared nine inherent rights as Mushkegowuk first nations: We have the right to maintain our spiritual values, our language, our traditions and our culture; the right to self-government; we have the right to a decent standard of living; we have the right to be the guardian of the land and the resources; we have the right to live on the land and we have the right to develop and harvest the land; we have the right to share the wealth of the land; we have the right to respect the spirit and intent of the treaties and agreements which affect our people; and, finally we have the right to recognize our own laws over the laws of the crown.

Ontario was a witness to Treaty 9. Ontario benefited and grew and flourished as a result of acquiring our land and our resources. One of the treaty commissioners, Duncan Campbell Scott, later admitted that the treaty was not properly explained. He admitted that an oral promise was made that our grandfathers' method of making a living

would never be interfered with. What is Ontario doing to help our harvesters, reeling from the effects of changes in the fur industry? Another of the unwritten promises was that we would receive farming implements, livestock and sawmills in the name of economic development in today's technology.

Historians who study the treaty-making process can only conclude that when our grandfathers signed the treaty, or had their names forged, they were agreeing to oral promises, not the written text. Not only were we excluded from Confederation, we were excluded through deception.

Ontario's new government has taken one brave step in recognizing that self-government is an inherent right. The next step is to recognize that our treaty forms the basis of our relationship with Confederation and that the written version of our treaty is invalid. The leg was chopped off in 1905 and again in 1930 when the commissioners went to Winisk.

We have developed a unique self-government process which we call "partners in change." It involves all residents in our region of the province, native and non-native, as well as the federal and provincial governments, in looking at our common needs. In the health field we are planning a unified health care system. Treaty and aboriginal rights are recognized in this process. As Premier Rae is aware, chronic care co-payments are a violation of treaty promises. In the education field, we are working with the school boards, first nations and educational authorities to achieve the highest standard of education service while respecting local control.

Your government has given some support to these initiatives, but more is needed to be done so we can solve our own social and economic problems in our own ways.

As you look at the map of Ontario and wonder all about the various aboriginal political organizations, do not be fooled into thinking that we are just another tribal council. We do not use that word. That is Indian Affairs terminology.

2100

In this province, there are three main Indian groups: the Iroquois, the Ojibwa in the south and the northwest, and the Mushkegowuk or Cree in the northeast. The Mushkegowuk first nations wish to sign a formal self-government accord with your government, recognizing our uniqueness and our desire to address a broad range of issues directly with your government. With real commitment from your government, we can address social and economic issues as partners and begin to reverse the imbalance created in 1905. We can even begin to think about becoming part of Confederation.

Thank you for listening.

Mr Winninger: First, I agree it is unfortunate that we cannot translate these proceedings in each and every case into Cree or Ojibway or Oji-Cree, but we are making efforts, as we did at Sioux Lookout, to do that. Perhaps in the future, such as Toronto, we can translate our proceedings into your native tongue.

One important lesson I have learned from this tour is how much we have to learn from the first nations about such values as kindness, sharing, honesty and strength, as the previous speaker mentioned. There is a lot that has to

be done to redress the social and economic injustices of the past, and this government, as you know, has committed itself to negotiating self-government agreements, settling land claims and improving the quality of life for both status and non-status natives.

These are more than mere empty words. I was present when native justices were sworn in in Attawapiskat and negotiating self-government in Gore Bay and this sort of thing. A lot has been done in a very short time, but I agree with you that there is a lot more that has to be done so you will be able to assert your pride and dignity and have a sense of equal partnership, to use the words of another speaker.

It would seem that the negotiation of self-government agreements across Ontario will certainly continue apace. I know there are ongoing negotiations. Certainly the terms and conditions of the Nishnawbe-Aski nation agreement are being looked into by Bob Rosehart, and similar self-government arrangements across the province are being carried forward. I trust that you will bear with us as we deal with these complex problems and hopefully we can come to terms with some of these injustices you have so eloquently stated today.

Mr Beer: I want to follow up on the point David was talking to you about, Alex. It seems to me that one of the things we have found over the years as we have tried to move towards self-government is that it can be a more complicated road than we would like it to be. In the past while, we have tried looking at, especially with the province, areas where native organizations such as your own can in effect take over the self-management, self-administration, whatever term you want to apply, for a variety of programs; I am thinking of the ones you do in terms of the broad social service area along the whole coast of James Bay.

Do you see that perhaps the way to go in working with the province in particular would be to try to expand those kinds of agreements, whether in the social service area, health, policing, what have you, whereby in effect, in a kind of building block way, you really take over the management of a wide variety of programs that directly affect the native people within your area, and in that sense I suppose almost create a de facto self-governing situation? Because it seems we always get caught up in what the federal government is prepared to do, yet there are some steps that I think the province and native organizations have been able to take over the last decade which have been very positive in terms of the results for native self-government. I just wondered if you have thoughts on that.

Mr Spence: I guess I can only give an example at this time to tell the problems that we have to encounter, for instance, to address at this time to the Ontario government when it comes to land. I just want to give you an example.

In terms of our treaties, Ontario was part of the process. The agreement that the federal government and the Ontario government had was, the only land rights that we have is in our reserves, so as a guardian of the surrounding lands, it became the sole authority of the Ontario government. So when it comes to economic development and various companies are issued, for instance, working permits

or land use permits, the fact is that when you issue these work permits in our aboriginal lands, we automatically lose our entitlement to be living off the land, because of the way the policies are being set within the Ontario government. That is one of the things that has to be addressed before we get justice, and I am sure you are aware of it. One of the past ministers said he had to sit down with our people in the James Bay area. I am sure it was brought up in your meetings.

Ms Churley: I just want to thank you for your positive presentation. I am glad to see that you feel that there is some hope, and this is as a fairly new person to government. I am learning a lot. We had many native people come and talk to us in the northwest, and every time somebody speaks, I learn something more. I wish we did have more time to hear your presentations. I am very encouraged when I hear messages of hope because I understand that you have been saying the same things to a lot of politicians for a long time and not really getting anywhere.

I would just like to ask you, not only with the new government in Ontario, because certainly the federal government has a large say in these matters, if you are feeling more hope in general because of the various things that have happened lately, Oka and what happened with Meech and the large aboriginal voice in that. Are you feeling a trend in the general population in terms of people being more sympathetic and more understanding and more respectful now?

Mr Spence: Certainly there is a general awareness now in the public about the way the native people feel, and we still have got a lot to learn from our own native people, from us. When you talk about Confederation, for instance, for the last thousand years, even within what we call Canada today or North America, it has been proved that at one time there is 152 different native languages in Canada, and there was never a question if you are going to be able to speak in only two languages.

It is just the fact that we were given a chance to speak our language, because once you use your languages, it comes from the heart and it is really hard to bring your spirit down when it comes from the heart, especially using your own language. So I think that is one of the messages we would like to give to the select committee to be considered, whatever your definition of Confederation might be, when you start talking about this process.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Spence.

Mr Spence: Meegwetch.

The Vice-Chair: Meegwetch.

We have a number of names that were brought before our committee. As you are aware, there was a table in the back where people were able to come up and ask to speak to our committee, basically on a first come, first served basis. I have got a couple of names I am going to go through. Some of them, I think, may not be here but we will go through it anyway. We tell these people that we are going to give them five minutes. We are going to have to be fairly strict on that. The television crews here have to take down all of the equipment and be in Sudbury for early tomorrow morning, so we will have to keep you down to five minutes.

2110

KEN METSALA

The Vice-Chair: The first person we will call is Ken Metsala. How are you doing?

Mr Metsala: Thanks very much, Gilles. First off, I would like to say it is so refreshing to see people in government coming to hear what people have to say. I am really overwhelmed and have been very humbled by the wonderful speeches that the people have made here tonight. Their summations have been just wonderful. I have really had my eyes opened on a lot of issues myself.

I just heard about this citizens' forum being in Timmins by reading the Globe and Mail yesterday, and coming home from work, I decided I would like to air a few things that I think are very important to this young government. I have to make them short, so I will try the best I can with what I have got here. I did not stick to the exact format that you people had, because I did not have one. Anyway, I am going to talk about what I think is very important just in a quick way here.

We have talked about human issues here tonight, and one of the biggest human issues that we have not talked about, and I think that the people of this province would like to talk about, is what is happening with the job losses in Ontario. I really believe that these job losses have been the instrument of Ottawa through poor financial planning, running high deficits and meanwhile telling all of Canada that we have to cut back in our own personal lives to basically keep inflation down. But when are the economists of the government of Canada going to listen to the fact that the government, by spending so many huge amounts of dollars over what it is taking in, is the sole cause of inflation. It is not the people who are trying to scratch out a living for their children and put them through school.

All the people I know in the last couple of years have found that their incomes are being stretched to the limit. They are going backwards. We are not going ahead any more, and I think the number one overwhelming reason why we are going backwards with attaining business in Ontario is our high level of taxation, federally and provincially. The rich are not paying any more.

We have to have a more equitable taxation system where everyone pays a flat tax, then no-one can complain. We will all carry our fair share. That is the only way we are going to get over this. The GST is driving businesses out of southern Ontario in droves. You can hear about trade missions all the time in Toronto, people coming up from Alabama, Georgia, and saying, "Sign up, come on down," and businesses are going. We have to stop it.

I think the only way we are going to make Ontario competitive by keeping industries here is by providing incentives for people to stay in school: a bigger emphasis on maths and sciences instead of soft arts. We cannot eat culture for breakfast. We have to have good, hard industry and smart kids coming into the workforce to carry this province, to finance these wonderful ideas that people have.

If we do not have the money, we can talk about this all night long; we are not going anywhere. We have to make some sobering decisions in regards to trying to streamline our education system, bring it under one roof, not three or four different school boards where you have English Catholic, French Catholic, English public and French public schools. We have to have one. Why can we not have one school system where if kids want to take English and French, they can take English and French, or if they want to take religion, they can take religion? We are getting spread out too far and offering too many things to too many people and we all have to pay for it.

One thing about, shall Quebec or shall it not? As far as I am concerned, and I have polled the people at work so I am not just speaking for myself, for years Ontario has made a definite effort to accommodate the demands of Quebec. We instituted bilingual programs through the province to show we care. An example is French immersion programs. Where are Quebec's English immersion programs to show they care? If we cannot speak, communicate with each other, how can we ever get along?

It is okay for Quebec to turn around and say, "We are going to preserve our language." Okay, fine, work at it at home, work at it in the schools, but teach your children another language, English, because people like to travel around and see what the rest of Canada is about. If they do not understand what we are talking about, how are we ever going to get along as a country?

Yet when Sault Ste Marie makes one thing about, "We are getting too complicated with too many bilingualism programs. We'll go unilingual," Brian Mulroney says this is heresy, it is terrible. What happened when Quebec came out with their French-only signs? What happened when they started cutting back on English funding for schools? Nothing. He said it is unfortunate. It is a pile of crap.

Anyway, surveys indicate some Quebecers think Canada is important, but high-profile Quebecers never support Canada. All we ever hear from Bourassa, Parizeau and Bouchard is, "Do this, give us this, make this change or we will leave." They sound like spoiled children. It is high time we give them a taste of tough love.

We have given them much in the last 20 years by providing Quebec with most-favoured status. The federal government has gone out of its way to give them extra government contracts to stimulate their employment situations, and I think it has been more than generous.

as far as I am concerned, Quebec must be allowed to go its own way. We can still remain friends, though, but they must be dealt the cards of reality up front. We cannot allow Brian Mulroney to negotiate an amicable settlement, as he is a Quebecer himself. As you can see from the way

he has been acting for the last three or four years, his interests lie in that area.

The Vice-Chair: Mr Metsala, there are a couple of questions from the committee. You can either use the rest of your time to sum up or go with questions.

Mr Metsala: Go ahead, shoot. I would love to answer questions.

Mr Harnick: You indicated that you were upset about governments spending more than they took in and I think you said that governments are offering too many things to too many people.

Mr Metsala: That is right.

Mr Harnick: What I want to ask you is, where does a government cut back? What programs are eligible, in your mind, to cut back on? I also want to know what you think about the principle of universal programs.

Mr Metsala: Universal programs; eg, medicare?

Mr Harnick: Those kinds of programs. That is right.

Mr Metsala: Okay, universal programs. I believe that the people of Ontario are entitled to good proper medical care. I also believe that everyone should have sound access to education. But our medical care system is being over-taxed. I believe that we have to look at alternative medicine in this country, like starting to stress things, how to cut down. We do not need more doctors.

We need counsellors to go to schools to tell children how to eat properly. How many children are not eating properly? The nutritional content of the average child's lunch in this province is terrible. It is high fat, high sugar. You can ask any nutritionist this. Kids do not eat well and they have to learn this at home. Lifestyles keep people from getting sick—good lifestyles.

We can cut back on our health care. We do not have to spend any more money. We have to educate the public that you just do not go to the doctor when you are sick. Health is something that you have to practise every day.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Metsala.

Next on the agenda is Liliame Laforest. Is Liliame in the audience? The other one is from the Kapuskasing Labour Council, Enzo Altobelli. Those are the names we have.

We have come to the conclusion of our hearings in Timmins. We would like to thank the community of Timmins for having us in the community today and allowing us to have the opportunity to listen to what the people of Timmins have to say.

On behalf of all the committee, thank you for having us. We will resume our sitting tomorrow morning in Sudbury from city hall at the Civic Centre at 9:30 in the morning.

The committee adjourned at 2118.

CONTENTS

Monday 11 February 1991

Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario/Alpha	C-229
Mayor Dennis Welin	C-231
Centre culturel La Ronde	C-232
Pierre Bélanger	C-235
École Secondaire Thériault	C-237
Perry James	C-239
Vic Power	C-240
Patrick Bamford	C-241
Corporation de la Ville de Hearst	C-243
Gary Whitman	C-245
Timmins Native Friendship Centre	C-248
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario, région de Kirkland Lake	C-251
Société des Universitaires de langue française de l'Ontario	C-251
Evening sitting	C-254
Jeanot LeGrange	C-254
Timmins Labour Council	C-254
Services à la jeunesse de Hearst	C-256
David Wallbridge	C-258
Aboriginal Urban Alliance	C-260
Shirley O'Connor	C-264
Mushkegowuk Council	C-266
Ken Metsala	C-268
Adjournment	C-269

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winner, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Martin, Tony (Sault Ste Marie NDP) for Ms Harrington**Also taking part:** Ramsay, David (Timiskaming L)**Clerk:** Manikel, Tannis**Clerk pro tem:** Brown, Harold**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Hansard Reporting Service, 481 Legislative Building, Toronto Ontario, M7A 1A2 Phone: (416) 965-1456 Fax: (416) 963-1387

XC2
-1990
052

Government
Publications



C-9 1991

C-9 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 12 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 12 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron



Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Tuesday 12 February 1991

The committee met at 0935 in the Civic Centre, Sudbury.

The Chair: I would like to call this meeting to order. My name, first of all, is Tony Silipo and I am the Chair of the Ontario select committee on Ontario in Confederation.

I want to say on behalf of the committee to all of the people who are here that we are pleased to be in Sudbury this morning and for the rest of the day in three sessions, this morning, this afternoon and this evening, to hear the views of the people of this area on the various aspects of people's thoughts and aspirations on constitutional matters and indeed aspects having to do with Confederation in general.

This is the second of four weeks of travels that we will be doing across the province. Last week had us in various communities in the northwest of the province, ending in Sault Ste Marie. Yesterday we were in Timmins and tomorrow we will be proceeding to North Bay, Thursday to Orillia and Collingwood, and then to other parts of the province in the two weeks following.

I know that there are a number of young people here in the audience and we are pleased about that. Many of them are from the secondary school here in Sudbury, and I welcome them on behalf of the committee. I gather with the group of students from Lasalle Secondary School is a former member of the Legislature, Sterling Campbell. I do not know where Mr Campbell is, but welcome, Mr Campbell.

I want to introduce the members of the committee. Normally we have nameplates, but part of the thing that happens in this hectic travel schedule is that sometimes things get stuck in different places, so the name tags may or may not arrive for members of the committee, but we do as we best can.

This is an all-party committee made up of representatives from the three political parties which have representatives at Queen's Park. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer; from the Conservative caucus there are Ernie Eves, who will no doubt be making his way in momentarily, and Charles Harnick; from the NDP caucus we have Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, who is also Vice-Chair of the committee, Fred Wilson, Marilyn Churley, Tony Martin and David Winninger. Also joining us today is the MPP for Algoma-Manitoulin, Mike Brown.

Just by way of the ground rules, we have a full list of deputies for this morning, and indeed throughout the rest of the day. What I would like to ask, as we have been doing in other locations to try to accommodate as many as possible, is, if there are other people whose names are not on the list but who would like to try to speak to us, that they please make themselves known to the clerk of the

committee who will be circulating, or to any of our people who will be around, and we will do our best.

In order to do that, we would like to ask the people who will be presenting if they can try to limit their presentations to about 10 minutes if they are individuals and about 20 minutes if they are here representing organizations. That will allow us, as best as possible, to try to get in as many different groups and individuals as we can.

The other thing I would like to say is that we would appreciate it if people would like to sit at the table with us when they are speaking or, if they prefer, they can use the podium at the end of the room.

ROGER ST-LOUIS

The Chair: I call the first person, Roger St-Louis, who is already here. M. St-Louis.

M. St-Louis : J'ai sept enfants et ils sont tous ici. J'ai fréquenté l'école de Sudbury.

Le but de cette présentation est d'illustrer les besoins spéciaux des personnes sourdes d'origine francophone de l'Ontario.

Il n'existe aucune donnée démographique sur les personnes sourdes et malentendantes francophones en Ontario, ni dans les autres provinces du Canada. Il faudrait mettre sur pied un comité pour faire un sondage afin de connaître le nombre de Franco-Ontariens sourds, car la majorité des personnes sourdes provenant de familles francophones ont été assimilées par les écoles anglaises et ont perdu leur identité et patrimoine. Les services en français qui sont quasiment inexistantes les ont forcées de passer par les organismes anglophones pour pouvoir rejoindre la clientèle francophone.

Il faudrait subventionner l'Association des sourds de l'Ontario pour obtenir un personnel adéquat afin de subvenir aux besoins primordiaux de la population sourde de l'Ontario, car depuis trop longtemps déjà, ce sont des bénévoles qui s'occupent du fonctionnement de cette association. Il ne va pas sans dire que la tâche devient parfois très lourde, voire écrasante à supporter. Nous avons donc un besoin immédiat de personnel pour gérer le tout, car les secteurs anglais et français desservis par le bénévolat ne peuvent plus durer.

En ce qui concerne les services éducationnels, beaucoup de ces services manquent ou sont inexistantes. Il nous faut de bons programmes pour éliminer l'analphabétisme. Ainsi, je souligne le fait que le problème de la surdité semble avoir créé un obstacle pour l'enfant sourd, soit-il français ou anglais : en raison de l'oppression de sa langue, il n'a pu surmonter les problèmes de l'analphabétisme, n'ayant aucun soutien pédagogique. Il n'a pu enrichir ses connaissances et devenir autonome.

Le besoin immédiat d'établir une école provinciale francophone pour les sourds en Ontario est urgent. Il est

très frustrant de se rendre compte que l'enquête provinciale du ministère de l'Éducation, qui a étudié les programmes à l'intention des enfants sourds, n'a pas encore menée à un financement équitable des programmes et des services à l'intention des enfants sourds franco-ontariens.

Plusieurs services manquent encore : la formation francophone de professionnels sensibilisés aux implications de la surdité ; l'accès aux services d'interprétariat oral et gestuel ; l'accès à un milieu qui respecte la culture des sourds ; et des services éducationnels, qui ne sont pas existants.

Le présent gouvernement accepte que la langue des sourds, LSQ, langue des signes québécois, et son équivalent en anglais, ASL, American sign language, soient introduites comme projet pilote. Nous attendons impatiemment les finances requises pour mettre en oeuvre les besoins immédiats.

Je vous énumère ces huit besoins fondamentaux :

1. Un centre de recherche linguistique sur la LSQ et production d'un dictionnaire adapté à la clientèle sourde franco-ontarienne ;

2. Mettre sur pied un centre pour la formation d'interprètes français ;

3. Une école française provinciale pour sourds francophones ;

4. La formation de professeurs pour l'enseignement de la LSQ ;

5. Des cours en LSQ crédités ;

6. Un centre culturel de folklore pour les Franco-Ontariens ;

7. Un centre de formation pour les professionnels sensibilisés aux implications de la surdité, à tous niveaux ;

8. Enchâsser notre langue, LSQ, et son équivalent en anglais, ASL, dans la constitution.

À l'heure actuelle, il n'existe pas de programmes de formation en français au niveau de la surdité en Ontario, ni dans les autres provinces. Les ressources humaines sont rares ou presque inexistantes, il va de même pour les ressources pédagogiques et matérielles adaptées à la surdité.

Pour la Charte des droits et libertés : il n'y a pas de barrières chez les entendants car ils ont accès à tout ce qu'ils peuvent toucher, tandis que chez les malentendants et les personnes sourdes il s'en trouve des barrières à tout. Il faudrait enchâsser notre langue LSQ et son équivalent en anglais ASL dans la constitution, car de là nos droits seraient respectés. Partout au Canada, les personnes sourdes ne sont pas respectées et sont mises de côté.

Aussi, les relations interprovinciales entre sourds sont importantes, car nous avons et utilisons tous le même mode de communication, c'est-à-dire le langage gestuel. La reconnaissance de la langue des signes propre à chaque communauté sourde est un mouvement mondial. C'est une langue qui sort de la clandestinité. Nous voulons lui donner sa pleine valeur. En plus, il ne faut pas perdre le Québec de vue. S'il veut se séparer, c'est à cause du manque de respect par les autres provinces. Peut-être que l'égoïsme prend le dessus dans les autres provinces ?

Alors il est temps de réfléchir comment le Québec et les sourds sont vus en général et comment l'on voit les

personnes sourdes en comparaison au Québec. Est-ce important ou non ?

Aussi, j'espère que le gouvernement de l'Ontario financera l'Association des sourds de l'Ontario afin de minimiser le fardeau déjà rendu trop lourd pour les bénévoles qui occupent les postes au sein de l'association.

Merci d'avoir bien voulu me donner quelques minutes pour vous citer cette présentation.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation. I think I can say on behalf of my colleagues that we have heard several times about the plight of the francophone deaf people and we realize that they need interpreters and that they need programs in LSQ, la langue des signes québécois. Certainly when we go back home, it is going to be one of the main things that we are going to be including in our report.

Could you tell me, in this area, are there exchanges between the deaf francophones with Quebec? For example, in training centres where they teach LSQ, do they have schools that are reserved for the deaf people? Before Ontario has its own programs, we should make sure that we work with Quebec so that there would be better services in Ontario.

Mr St-Louis: There are not too many interpreters in Quebec and it is the same throughout the province. It is the same in Quebec and in Ontario. There is not too much in French.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much, Mr St-Louis. May I ask you what the situation is at present? Do francophone deaf children leave this community to obtain their instructions? Is there a self-help group here? What is the actual status at the present time? I am very pleased that you enumerated so clearly the needs, some of which I had not even thought of, although they are very obvious. Could you tell us what the present situation is for deaf francophone children?

Mr St-Louis: We would like to set up a school for the deaf francophones over here. Right now they have to go outside and they have to go to Quebec, but we have to set up a school for the deaf francophone children over here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I certainly agree and I think that the family is very important. We heard this yesterday as well, that the children must leave the family for extended periods of time, and that no doubt has a great deal of effect on how they develop.

The Chair: Are there other questions? Merci, M. St-Louis.

0950

JOHN RODRIGUEZ

The Chair: I call next John Rodriguez, the member for Nickel Belt, MP.

Mr J. Rodriguez: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. Let me welcome all of my provincial colleagues who are on this committee to the great riding of Nickel Belt. I think it is wonderful. Never in the history of Nickel Belt have we seen so many southern Ontario MPPs located in one spot. We trust that this experience will open your eyes

to the realities of northern Ontario: the travel, the distance between communities, etc.

You may also have noticed that since we do not see MPPs gathered together in one group so often, we always take the opportunity to tell you everything that we have on our mind. It does not matter what it is. If we have an ingrown toenail, we will tell you about it.

Mr Chairman, I am pleased you have touched on this and I am pleased to see the young students, young people here today. You are the future Canadians, and it is important and imperative that you be part of history in the making. Your children and your grandchildren will be studying these events in school in years to come.

In contemplating my appearance before this committee, I was getting advice from people. One group of people said to me: "You're crazy, Rodriguez, absolutely crazy. This is a no-win situation. You're an elected member and this whole business of Constitution and the relationship between, for example, Quebec and the rest of the country, is a no-win situation. You are going to get out there and you are going to say things that are not going to endear you to the hearts of many of the people you represent. That is bad for you, bad for an elected politician."

On the other hand, there were others who said to me: "Elected politicians should have ideas, and not only should they have ideas, but they ought to share them. They ought to express the way they feel about our country and they should not think that they can't trust their constituents to understand." So it is a question of trust.

Therefore, I have chosen to come before this committee and express the way I feel. It is not a party line. I think the party is still sorting itself out on this one. But I have come here to tell you about how I feel about Canada and the relationships within the country and I base my remarks on a couple of realities about present relationships in Canada and a couple of observations about our federal structure.

The first reality is that a majority of Quebecers want to remain in Canada, provided there is a devolution of federal power. That is backed up by polls, the most recent one a Gallup in early January. The second reality is that a majority of Canadians believe that those living outside Quebec want Quebec to remain in Canada. That is in the same Gallup poll of early January.

The first observation I have made as a politician is that Canadians want changes in the way we are governed. The second observation is that Canadians want a say in the way those decisions are made about how we govern ourselves and about all aspects of national life, physical, cultural and economic.

I remember when I came to Canada in 1956. I went to the cinema, and of course, I came from a British colony. We had not thrown off the shackles of imperialism then. I came to Canada in 1956 and went to the movie, and what did I see on the screen before the movie started? They showed the Queen on a horse and they played God Save the Queen. We all stood up like the Duke of York marching up the hill and then we all sat down at the end of it.

Lo and behold, I was amazed to see that here was a country that was free and independent and our flag at that

time was the Union Jack. It was somebody else's flag. It was a foreign country's flag. When I asked about the Canadian Constitution I was told it was a British act. It was an act of the British Parliament and it was not here. I said, "Can I go and see it in Ottawa?" They said: "No, you cannot. You would have to go to Westminster in London." That is where it was kept.

I recall I was living in Toronto and the majority of Torontonians were white Anglo-Saxons. I could walk down the streets of Toronto for blocks and not see a face other than a white face. Now I want to tell you that today if you go down into Toronto and you walk a block, you probably see that out of three people, two faces would be of a distinct nature. What has happened is that there have been a lot of changes. It seems that there is one constant that I have come to accept; that one thing you can really bank on is that things change.

For some time now it has been my observation that Canadians, in a real sense, have felt straitjacketed by the system of what I call vertical federalism. For example, if you have travelled in western Canada, western Canadians are very suspicious of the east, particularly of Toronto. They see all the economic power centralized in Ottawa. Residents of Atlantic Canada see Ottawa's solution to their problems as relocating them. The Canada-US free trade agreement was entered into without proper consultation with the provinces, and now a further free trade agreement with Mexico is being designed without proper and adequate consultation with the provinces and the people. Provinces have established trade barriers against each other in an attempt to protect themselves. Imagine our having established a free trade agreement with the United States and we have not even collapsed the barriers between and among Canadian provinces.

The goods and services tax was a unilateral action by the federal government resulting in court challenges in Alberta, Ontario, New Brunswick and British Columbia. The most vivid example is the recent monetary policies of John Crow and Michael Wilson who are pursuing a high interest rate policy to dampen inflation. Where were the inflationary fires? They were certainly not in Alberta at 2% inflation. They certainly were not in the Atlantic provinces. The inflationary fires were particularly in Toronto and probably in the Golden Horseshoe. As a result we had a recession, so everybody suffers.

These all represent, in my view, perfect examples of what I call vertical federalism or the trickle-down theory of federalism, highly centralized decision-making with no input from Canadians. The cynical part of this kind of vertical federalism is that it often suited provincial governments to engage in fed bashing. Oftentimes provincial governments have won re-election simply because they bashed the feds: "But I can't do anything about this. It's the federal government. Can't do anything."

It seems to me that this is at the provincial level and the vertical federalism has further frustrated Canadians and left us scapegoating. Since we at the grass roots level cannot deal with the macro problems, we start dealing with the things we can touch, which is each other and so we start blaming everybody else: Manitoba and Quebec blaming

each other over the CF-18 contract; New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec over the frigate contracts; Ontario versus Quebec over the location of the space agency; aboriginal people take on the feds and the provinces over land claims and treaty rights; bilingualism where English rights groups claim that francophones are getting better treated; unemployed Canadians blame new immigrants for taking jobs from them.

In this climate, trust has been destroyed. Shut out from having a say, the provinces turn on each other in frustration.

I think we need to look at some changes and I think the Italians have a very nice word which we can apply in this situation in Canada and which we need, and the word is "risorgimento." What we need now in my view as part of this risorgimento is more horizontal federalism. We need to create a horizontal model which allows people to participate in decision-making that helps to build a country.

It means the barriers between provinces must come down, such as trade barriers. It means a lot more shared responsibility between federal and provincial governments. By definition, it rejects the image of Canada as a family where the federal government is head and the provinces are children. Can you imagine that concept I have heard so often, that Canada is a family and the federal government is the papa and all the little bears sit around the table and they are supposed to do what the feds tell them?

1000

I think we have to replace that. I like to think of the image of Canada where the federal government and the provinces sit down and there is a recognition that all have an equal responsibility to the people of Canada. This model recognizes that the first nations of Canada are entitled to self-government and a seat at the table of this new Confederation. This model would provide for co-ordination and harmonization which would eliminate much duplication, cut costs and time delays and eliminate frustration and misunderstanding.

We have been dealing with Bill C-83, which is the reorganization of financial institutions in this country, and I want to tell you, if any of you have ever looked at that, that it is one jungle. What you have is the federal government with one set of rules for the establishment of financial institutions and each province has its own and in many cases they are very different from the federal government's. In fact Ontario has what is called Ontario equals, which somehow means Ontario says, "I don't care what the other provinces have got for financial institutions organizations, but in Ontario you have to conform." This model would allow for national goal-setting and responsibilities would be more clearly established.

In conclusion, we ought not to lock ourselves into the positions of the past. I have always felt that a Constitution that served the previous generation well may not be appropriate to today's generation. It seems to me that constitutions evolve in concert with the needs of people. Since the Old Testament has paraphrased me well, I think I should repeat it, "You can't put new wine in old wineskins." I

think people are looking for something that more reflects the needs of the present generation.

I thank you for your kind attention and if there are any questions I am prepared to try and dialogue with you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Rodriguez. We are beyond the time, but I know that there is a lot of interest from members of the committee. I will allow one, possibly two, questions, if we can try to keep them brief.

Mr F. Wilson: Mr Rodrigues, we have heard from municipal politicians, of course, but you are the first elected federal politician to come before us. I think you may have started somewhat of a trend. We will see that as we progress.

You mentioned a couple of things that we have noticed in the last few days, the feeling of lack of input from Canadians and the frustration, and we have even seen some scapegoating going on. We will address those, of course, in our deliberations over the next few weeks in our report to come in later on.

What I would like to take the opportunity to ask you right now, based on your experience and your years of service to the country, is at some point we will be reaching out to other commissions and other committees in Canada and of course the federal initiative also, and what do you think we can expect or should we be looking for when we do reach out to sort of co-ordinate or co-operate or share information with those groups, considering that at some point we are all going to be coming together at some place and time to solve the dilemma we are presently in?

Mr J. Rodriguez: As far as I understand your task, this first round is to really get people to sort of loosen up and let you know where they are at. This is why I have not been suggesting very specific things about federal-provincial relations. I thought the first thrust of the committee was to really get people talking and let you know where we are coming from and how we feel. I think when you get into your next phase and as you approach groups, I would think that you would want to direct people with very specific questions.

This booklet was very good with questions: fluffy, but you could not do this in 10 minutes. All these areas, talking about how we can make Canada strong and a competitor globally, which is the new language now, well, you could not do that in 10 minutes, so I think you will have to sort of target the kinds of questions more specifically and give the groups adequate time so that they can do this. I find this is a very instant kind of Constitution, consulting on the hoof, so to speak. So you will need to do it with much more time and be more targeted.

Mr Eves: I think that some of the points you make near the end of your presentation are good ones. I must say that through our first week and now a day and some of hearings, I certainly have been surprised and I would guess that the majority of members on the committee have been surprised as to how many individuals have said that their vision of Canada is a strong central or federal government so that there can be national programs and standards set across Canada.

I have been sort of struck by the fact that most individuals who have appeared before the committee, to date anyway, have said that if anything, they feel perhaps the federal government has been somewhat lacking in not exercising enough authority and providing enough national vision in programs, which seems to go contrary to having stronger provincial governments and contrary to the *Alaire* report which came out in Quebec a few days ago.

I wonder if you might comment on that.

Mr J. Rodriguez: On this question of strong central governments, I have always been leery about strong central governments. The Soviet Union has a strong central government. China has a strong central government. We have got to be careful, brother.

Mr Eves: I am just telling you what the people are saying.

Mr J. Rodriguez: Yes, I know.

Mr Eves: You may not want to listen to them. I guess that is your prerogative—

Mr J. Rodriguez: No, I am not taking you on, but—

Mr Eves: —brother.

Mr J. Rodriguez: You know, Ernie, you impinge on my riding and I am glad to see at least you are getting the language.

Mr Eves: I have been here before, John.

Mr J. Rodriguez: No, I am not of the school that thinks that a strong central government or a strong provincial government is what will do it. I am of the opinion that together, both levels of government—and the municipal governments to a large extent, because oftentimes the municipal government is the recipient of actions taken up the line. What we have to realize is that there should be horizontal federalism in effect. It is not a strong central government, but each level of government has a responsibility to the people it governs and if you are imbued with that sense of responsibility, when you sit down to set goals, you look to see how you can benefit the country as a whole.

We saw John Crow and Michael Wilson, as an example, exercising strong central government and saying, "We will be following a high interest rate policy and damn the horses." What has happened is that the spinoff effects to the regions and the hinterland have been disastrous. Their economies were just coming out of the recession of the 1980s and bang, they get slapped down again.

I have to get away from this kind of macho politics of the strong federal government or a strong provincial government and try to imbue in both levels of government that there is more to be gained by sitting down collectively, recognizing a responsibility and planning together. I hear this from people who tell me, "We want more opportunities for input." People want to have a say. The only way they can have a say is, in my view, through more horizontal federalism, more opportunities to do things co-operatively rather than this business of top-down operations.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Rodriguez. I know that there are a number of other questions, but we simply will not have the time to deal with them. I would just end by

saying that on the last point you made that people wanted to have a say, that certainly is a message we have been getting very clearly. Even before that message was beginning to be delivered to us we had talked and are continuing to talk within the committee about different ways to make sure that the discussion does in fact continue, because we see this stage as simply the first part of a two-part process that we need to go through, so thank you for your views.

1010

JEAN LÉVEILLÉ

The Chair: At this point I am going to ask a group that I gather was supposed to have been on the list, but for some reason was not. There is a group of students, I gather, from Espanola with Jean Léveillé, if they would like to come forward now and make their presentation.

M. Léveillé : Monsieur le Président, mesdames, messieurs du comité, il ne m'appartient pas souvent de me présenter devant un comité. Si je me présente devant vous aujourd'hui, c'est que j'ai à coeur l'avenir de mon pays et je crois qu'il est de mon devoir de faire une contribution, si modeste soit-elle, à titre de simple citoyen. C'est aussi, et probablement surtout, parce que je suis enseignant d'histoire du Canada dans la région et il me semblait que l'occasion était toute choisie pour faire vivre un peu d'histoire à mes étudiants.

Je n'ai pas l'intention de vous entretenir sur tous les aspects de notre Confédération, mais j'aimerais exprimer certaines idées sur ce qu'il me semble réaliste pour le Canada de l'avenir, compte tenu des efforts infructueux des décennies passées.

Je suis enseignant depuis 1956 et c'est depuis cette année-là que je m'intéresse à l'avenir des miens, les Canadiens français, particulièrement ceux qui, comme moi, sont Franco-Ontariens. Avant même que la Loi sur les langues officielles ne soit promulguée, tous les Canadiens savaient que le Canada était un pays bilingue, un pays où l'anglais et le français jouissaient d'un certain respect comme le démontrent au moins depuis 1936 les billets de banque canadiens. À ma connaissance, il n'est jamais apparu une autre langue que l'anglais et le français sur ces billets et pourtant, nombreux sont les Canadiens qui aujourd'hui semblent croire que le français n'a pas plus droit de cité au pays que des langues étrangères comme l'italien ou l'allemand, pour n'en nommer que deux.

La lutte pour la reconnaissance du français n'a vraiment jamais cessé depuis les plaines d'Abraham. Les troubles de 1837 au Bas-Canada, l'affaire Riel, la crise d'octobre de 1970, les tentatives infructueuses récentes des gouvernements d'inclure les francophones dans le giron canadien n'ont rien fait, à mon avis, pour apprivoiser l'attitude des Anglo-Canadiens face à l'acceptation des francophones à part entière, et ce d'un océan à l'autre. Au contraire, il me semble que tous ces événements ont servi à alimenter l'intolérance, l'intransigence voire la haine à travers le pays. Les propos tenus récemment par les adeptes du groupe extrémiste APEC, Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada, le démontrent clairement. Les membres de cette association notoire n'ont pas été les premiers à essayer leurs pieds sur le drapeau du Québec.

Le 28 novembre 1967, le journal *Le Droit* cite Daniel Johnson, le premier ministre du temps au Québec, d'avoir fait de sa province «un ghetto français». E.C. Manning, le premier ministre d'alors au Manitoba, déclarait : «Proclamer la langue française langue officielle dans ma province créerait des remous qui nuiraient à l'unité nationale». On sait maintenant d'où viennent les propos de son fils, Preston Manning.

Il fut un temps, à l'époque Robarts, où il nous était permis d'espérer que l'Ontario embarque à l'instar du Canada et du Nouveau-Brunswick et se prononce bilingue. Effectivement, le 5 février 1968, *Le Droit* annonçait que la province d'Ontario se déclarait bilingue. Ce fut une fausse joie. Près de 25 ans plus tard, nous sommes encore rendus au point où les francophones de l'Ontario réclament des institutions collégiales et universitaires françaises. Tout le monde sait qu'au Québec, les anglophones jouissent de ces institutions depuis fort longtemps. De fait, l'Université McGill existe depuis bien avant le tournant du siècle.

Le 25 août 1967, les journaux proclamaient que les francophones de l'Ontario avaient enfin leurs écoles secondaires. Il est vrai que beaucoup de régions de la province jouissent aujourd'hui des services de ces écoles, mais il est aussi vrai que dans certains coins où il n'en existe pas, comme à Espanola où j'enseigne, les francophones s'assimilent à un rythme effarant. À titre d'exemple, permettez que je vous souligne qu'à mon école, sur un total de 932 étudiants dont 124 sont des autochtones, j'ai dénombré 247 dont le nom est de consonance française et qui ne parlent plus le français. Ces propos ressemblent étrangement à ceux que vous tenait Émile Blouin de Kenora la semaine dernière. Vous serez surpris d'apprendre que le French Town d'antan n'existe plus à Espanola et que seulement 45 étudiants sont inscrits au cours de français. Les étudiants que vous voyez derrière moi sont les seuls à prendre un cours en français qui soit autre que le français en 10^e année. Certains appellent ça de l'intégration, moi j'appelle ça de l'assimilation systématique qui s'apparente à du génocide culturel.

It appears very clear to me that the province is more interested in its relatively new population of visible minorities than it is to grant the francophones their institutions and provide them with the means by which they can achieve their full potential. Only yesterday the newspapers were telling us that the present government was to spend \$25 million to promote the visible minorities and women in society. While these are indeed noble intentions and deeds, the francophones of Ontario are caught yet in another legal struggle to affirm their rights, this time concerning the right of French-speaking Ontarians to be treated on the same level as the English-speaking Ontarians concerning their choice of support for educational purposes.

The problem appeared three years ago and has not been solved since. *Le Droit* states that a group of Franco-Ontarians has decided to ask the court for justice in this matter. Ontario has not been at all fair to its French-speaking population in general. Towns like Belle-Rivière and Pointe-aux-Roches have suddenly become Belle River and Stony Point. The francophones were indeed lucky to have

been able to put the acute accent back on Orléans. Is there a word that is more French than Orléans? It too had been anglicized. It appeared that our government wants to prove Mr Lévesque right when he said that the francophones outside Quebec were dead ducks.

Les propos que je tiens vous semblent peut-être pessimistes mais croyez-moi, je n'ai jamais cessé d'espérer pour l'avenir de mon pays. Je crois que la façon la plus efficace de le sauver de la fragmentation c'est d'enrayer l'ignorance. À ceux qui prétendent que le bilinguisme coûte trop cher, je réponds que tout coûte cher. La paix coûte cher, la guerre coûte cher, le bilinguisme coûte cher. A mon avis, ce qui coûte encore plus cher, c'est bien l'ignorance.

Je crois que le ministère de l'Éducation aurait avantage à travailler de concert avec les autres provinces dans le but d'introduire un autre élément obligatoire dans les cours d'étude des Canadiens. Cet élément pourrait se donner la mission de détruire les mythes et les faussetés qui enflamment la tête des extrémistes et, espérons-le, pourrait servir à consolider les liens qui nous unissent plutôt que de concentrer sur les différences qui nous séparent.

The Chair: Question, Mr Malkowski?

Mr Malkowski: I was quite impressed with your presentation and your points and it has given me a better understanding on some of the issues. I would like to know what your opinion is of the Ontario government making a commitment to bilingual education and education, be it preschool right up to the secondary level, in both official languages and if that should be a requirement, and if you feel that it would help reverse the situation that we are presently experiencing regarding bilingualism to add in multiculturalism as well so that heritage can be continued and carried on. I am just wondering what your reaction to that would be.

M. Léveillé : Monsieur le Président, je crois comprendre que le gouvernement s'est engagé à donner aux francophones comme aux anglophones un système d'éducation qui va de la maternelle jusqu'à l'université. Je n'ai pas vu où on promettait l'université encore. J'ai vu où on a promis le collège ; il en existe un à Ottawa. J'ai vu où on voulait en promettre un dans le nord et dans le sud, mais on n'a pas encore touché à la question de l'université. Dans mon coin on ne pourrait pas, dans les conditions actuelles, offrir aux francophones tous les cours qui sont nécessaires à leur épanouissement et c'est le nombre qui fait la différence. Si le gouvernement pouvait nous donner les moyens de nous permettre l'éducation dans toutes les matières, on le ferait. Jusqu'à maintenant ça nous a été refusé, et c'est simplement les moyens financiers qui nous le refusent, non pas la volonté politique.

1020

Mr Malkowski: If I could have a supplementary question?

The Chair: Very briefly, yes.

Mr Malkowski: Do you want to see the programs, be they francophone or anglophone, separated, or schools be separated, or would you rather see them be together?

M. Léveillé : Il a été prouvé fois après fois et surtout dans un rapport dont j'oublie le nom mais qui date de 1986, que les écoles mixtes sont néfastes pour les francophones et je suis de cet avis. Si on en juge par les résultats que notre école obtient avec son éducation des francophones — je pense aux 247 élèves qui sont assimilés présentement — je ne vois pas là un grand succès.

RICHARD LOGTENBERG

The Chair: I would like to call now Richard Logtenberg.

Mr Logtenberg: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, my name is Richard Logtenberg and I am a grade 13 student at Lasalle Secondary School here in Sudbury. I have been closely guarding over the past year my views on the political and social climate surrounding the crisis of Canadian unity. However, given the opportunity to present my views before your committee, I felt the need to take to the stand and express my feelings on this vital issue. For this opportunity, I thank you.

On 1 November, Prime Minister Mulroney announced his creation of a new commission, a commission whose job it was to find a consensus among the Canadian people on the future of Confederation. As I am sure you realize, this is the Spicer commission, the federal counterpart to your committee. Now admittedly, Canadian nationalism in the true sense of the word has never been overpowering, but lately I have feared that it had almost completely disappeared, and if our Prime Minister has been forced to consider the feelings of the public on this issue, then the immediate situation must be worse than I have imagined.

Perhaps the reason for this loss of nationalism is that we have become affected by numerous internal and external influences. These influences have caused us to lose many of the values that once made us unique among people of the world. Of these influences, I feel the present Canada-Quebec separation crisis poses the greatest threat, for Canada's failure to responsibly deal with the language and cultural concerns raised by Quebecers has led Confederation to the brink of collapse. Unless action is taken soon, the separation of Quebec from Canada will become an imminent reality.

However, I do not propose to be an alarmist without elaborating, without offering some possible solutions. But it must be remembered that before anything can be resolved, Canadians must become the great peacemakers and compromisers that we have long claimed to be.

Much of the unrest in Quebec today has its immediate roots in the 1950s and 1960s. During this period Quebec underwent the quiet revolution. French Canadian attitudes of what the good life was and what a proper society should be went through a transformation. Through mass-communication media, especially TV, French Canadians came to realize just how much English Canada had come to encroach upon Quebec society. The areas of Westmount and St James Street of Montreal became hated symbols of the economic dominance held by the English in Quebec affairs and industry.

As a result, Quebecers began with a vengeance to demand the expulsion of English Canada from the upper echelon of Quebec society. By the nationalizing of many private electrical utility companies and their subsequent incorporation into Hydro-Québec, the then Premier, Jean Lesage, began to respond to these pleas. Hydro-Québec became completely managed and operated by francophones. The English-dominated white-collar job market became partially accessible to Quebecers. However, the English remained the scapegoat, as they were blamed for repressing the French as well as for causing the slow decay of the French language and culture. This attitude has become a common sentiment throughout Quebec and has grown in time to a radical pitch. It has manifested itself in the Front de libération du Québec, the Parti québécois and many other separatist organizations and institutions.

To aid in the restructuring of their own economic community and to prevent further radicalism, Quebec must be granted the power that it has long sought. I believe that this would help to ensure the fair and equal distribution of jobs and wealth in Quebec.

The resentment Quebecers have long felt about the lack of control they have had over their own economic community has united them with a common purpose. This, coupled with a long historical fight for the preservation of their language and culture, has fuelled the fire of burning nationalism. With the resurgence of Quebec nationalism in the last few decades, Canada has become increasingly unstable and emotionally torn. Canadians have lost faith in their country, feeling it is simply a matter of time before we become either a weak and divided collection of provinces or just 10 more states under the control of good old Uncle Sam. As a result, English Canadians resolutely fear Quebec nationalism for the harm they perceive it will do to the nation as a whole. This fear, and the actions governed by it, are what pose the greatest threat to Confederation. For to fear, suspect and ultimately to suppress the values of one quarter of our population is not only dangerous, it is completely undemocratic and inherently ignorant.

What this does is encourage radical Quebec nationalism to grow and it promotes a hatred of Canadian Confederation. We will learn, perhaps too late, that nationalism is not something that cannot simply be dismissed. It will grow much stronger, more widespread, increasingly more radical and much less willing to compromise. As English Canadians, we must realize this and become willing to negotiate openly and wisely with Quebec. Proposals such as those outlined in the recently released Allaire report may be our last bargaining tool to keep Quebec in Confederation.

The Allaire report, which was commissioned by the Quebec Liberal government, set out to find through constitutional reform what was needed to ensure the preservation of Quebec's language and culture. Quebec politicians have argued that English Canada is strangling the Quebec culture. This belief is unfounded. The former control by the English of the economics of Quebec has little bearing on the present decline of indigenous Quebec art and culture.

It has long been said in many European nations that the artistic spirit of a country defines its culture. It is the creative

output of its authors, songwriters and artists that is the pure and tangible form of the beliefs and values of a people. These works of art help people realize their common identity. The truly united and strongly nationalistic countries have therefore placed artistic and cultural growth as an important priority. Thus a country becomes identifiable to itself and to the world by its artistic and cultural works.

Quebec politicians, however, have failed to come to this realization, believing that the artistic community is a mere frill in the presence of a greater need, the preservation of language and culture. This is a completely self-defeating philosophy. Because they have encouraged the economic growth of Quebec, these politicians have unintentionally suppressed the growth of indigenous culture, for to play an active role in the North American economic community one must speak the language of commerce, this being English, not French. Thus the problem of assimilation continues to be apparent. To correct this contradiction, Quebec must first support its artistic community if it wishes to preserve its language and culture. This includes the promotion of literature, music, art, and especially television and movies. Quebec must be on the leading edge of artistic growth in Canada because, according to its politicians, it has the most to lose.

Ontario and English Canada as a whole must also promote this sort of artistic and cultural growth if Confederation is to survive. Among nations of the world, Canadian priorities concerning indigenous art parallel those of Third World nations. We have become complacent and satisfied to import American culture or, at best, to imitate it. As a famous indigenous Canadian author said, "The shape and nature of this country demand that the strong support the weak." If this means giving our presently weak artistic community a chance to grow, then we must allow it.

We must incorporate Quebec art and culture with that of Ontario, as well as that of each region in Canada if we are to discover the true Canadian identity. We have long claimed to support multiculturalism. It is time now to expand on and amalgamate what our many immigrants and long-standing residents culturally offer and revitalize the Canadian community. We must do justice to the fundamental uniqueness that makes us distinct among the nations of the world. Until this is done, the future of Confederation will always be in question.

I hope that your committee will bring my message to Mr Rae, and ultimately to Ontarians and Canadians everywhere, so that when decisions are finally made, the best interests of Canada will always be paramount. Thank you very much and good luck.

1030

The Chair: Thank you very much, Rick. I think, as we certainly have found in our travels throughout, that when we have young people speaking before us, there is a certain amount of clarity and precision in your thoughts that sometimes is missing in others, and thank you for that. We will have time for probably one question. Mrs O'Neill.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Richard, thank you so much for coming this morning. I certainly feel that you have added some very concrete thoughts that have not been presented be-

fore, two that I wanted to highlight before I ask you the question.

I think you are very accurate in your observation of the impression that fear has on people. I think it is one of the most debilitating of our emotions and I think that your explanation of what it is doing to our situation, both inside and outside the province of Quebec, is very accurate.

I also feel very strongly that your observations on the arts are very accurate, and I think the people, the actual Québécois, understand that. I think you are right that the government has not supported them in their desire, and I know that because of the riding I represent in Ottawa.

I would like for you to say a little more about the Allaire report if I would ask you to, because you have read quite a bit about that and I am very pleased because that is a pretty up-to-date document. Would you say a little bit about some of the things there, of the 22 requests for negotiation? Could you say a little bit about some of the things that you think are possible for us to share governance, province with federal government?

Mr Logtenberg: You mean you would like to know the powers that I feel that we can share?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you say a little bit about it?

Mr Logtenberg: The powers that I feel that the provinces can share as under a federal government are basically the ones outlined in the Allaire report—defence, external affairs, situations like this, monetary causes and stuff. I do not agree with the issue of transfer payments. Unfortunately, I feel that is going to harm a lot more provinces by making them complacent than it will by encouraging them to grow.

I feel that many of the issues that the Allaire report has outlined, for example, the concerns on energy, the demands for political autonomy, these types of things are important for the provinces themselves to hold, especially because of the situation we have with Quebec. So basically what I am saying is I accept the Allaire report. I accept what it has offered with a few reservations, but I feel that it might be our best bet at this moment.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for bringing us such an informed brief.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

FRED AND JULIE JOHANNES

The Chair: Could I call next Mr and Mrs Johannes.

Mr F. Johannes: Thank you, Mr Chairman. Our presentation takes 11 minutes and 30 seconds. Could you bear that?

The Chair: Okay. It is within the latitude that we have, that is fine.

Mr F. Johannes: My wife and I do not represent any particular interest group. We have had the privilege of living in three Canadian provinces and are fortunate enough to have strong friends in each of the 10 provinces.

Throughout the years, we have voted for all three major parties, sometimes jointly, sometimes cancelling out our votes. We are concerned about the obvious social, economic and political deterioration of this country. In our opinion, there are two things the Ontario government can

and should do to halt the deterioration and promote a program of growth.

First, we ask that all parties commit to holding a referendum on constitutional proposals. Second, we ask for an Elections Act which makes elected officials more accountable to the electorate.

On the Constitution:

Meech Lake, as we all know, was drawn up behind closed doors without any public input. From its conception it was immediately endorsed by all three parties, not because it was obviously good for the country but because failure to support the legislation would be portrayed as a rejection of Quebec, and without Quebec support no party could hope to be successful at the federal level. The party leaders spread the word, and official support became mandatory throughout the country.

The legislation was touted as a major victory for the great conciliator. Inevitably, the weaknesses of the accord started to come to light. Trudeau, with no election to win, pointed out that it severely weakened federal powers; Carstairs drew our attention to the dilution of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; Lalonde and Wells implied that it would give legislative powers to Quebec that would not be shared by other provinces.

At that time in Sudbury we talked to 37 people, 36 of whom were against the accord. We then took a train trip across Canada and we found out that the support in Sudbury was stronger than it was in the rest of Canada.

As Meech Lake approached its decision date, we heard Mulroney declare that eight provinces, representing 90% of the population, supported the accord. The truth of the matter was that 90% of the elected politicians were blatantly disregarding the wishes of their electorates. Nine premiers and the Prime Minister applauded each other as being great Canadians. They unanimously agreed, however, that in the future, Canadians should be given more say in constitutional matters, and then they remained silent as the Prime Minister manipulated the schedule to preclude any chance in Newfoundland for its preferred referendum.

Politics in Canada had reached a new high. Were we not proud of the way Lowell Murray and Brian Mulroney attempted to maintain the deadline in Newfoundland while extending it in Manitoba? Was this not honourable and fair? Would we not want our children raised to reflect such high ethics and morality? Were we not impressed with the manner in which the Newfoundland PCs bent over backwards to represent their constituents in the free vote?

Were we not envious of the three parties in Manitoba who had committed themselves to hearing all the representations of their citizens? And were we not even more impressed when they could make their decision before they heard the citizens? Did this not assure the people of Manitoba and their native leaders that their concerns would be properly assessed and given the consideration they deserved?

Meech Lake, for all its faults, has greatly increased the political awareness of all Canadians. We have learned that elected politicians have not been given the freedoms and authority to represent the views of their ridings; we have

seen that the so-called free votes cannot assure true representation and that open hearings such as this are only useful in forming opinions.

There is one and only one way to guarantee that Canadians can be truly represented on constitutional matters, and that vehicle is the referendum. We request that all three parties agree to give the people of Ontario the right to vote by referendum on all constitutional amendments, and that this be enshrined in the Ontario constitution before the next constitutional proposal is tabled.

My wife and I prefer the Australian procedure on constitutional reform, in which the proposals are drafted by non-political institutions and passage is dependent on 50% referendum approval in each of the country's six states. Premiers should not assume that they have the right to represent their citizens on constitutional matters. Constitutional amendments must be designed for the benefit of all Canadians. We do not want our premiers vying for greater power at the expense of other provinces and other citizens. Just give us the right to vote.

1040

Mrs J. Johannes: On the Elections Act:

This country and this province have degenerated to the point where on too many issues our elected officials are not representing the majority wishes of their constituents. This situation exists at all levels of government, including the municipal, provincial and federal levels. Democracy appears to reign for the one day on which we cast our votes and is immediately followed by four years of dictatorship, with more allegiance paid to the big campaign contributors than to the electorate. Too often we see the big fund-raisers rewarded with high-paying patronage jobs with life-long indexed pensions, all paid out of public funds.

Not long ago, Lloyd Axworthy announced that he could not run in the leadership race because he could not get the necessary financing from big business because of his opposition to the free trade deal. It does not take much to extrapolate that the leaders of both the Liberals and PCs are backed by big business. It is no coincidence that we now have a free trade deal which gives major advantages to a multinational while promised relief to workers who lost jobs as a result of government policy remains virtually invisible. Extending the qualification period for unemployment insurance is not the solution preferred by the electorate.

Statistics Canada recently announced that the top 20% of our nation increased its share of the national wealth, while the middle class lost ground and the poor, as always, remained poor. The imposition of the regressive GST, which increases the tax burden on the middle- and low-income groups, is hardly the best solution to reverse this trend. These are not isolated incidences. Linda McQuaig's book, *Behind Closed Doors*, outlines in graphic detail how the rich and influential have manipulated the tax system so that the rich get richer while the poor get poorer. Canadians do not want the systematic destruction of their middle class. The previously mentioned legislation was passed in spite of overwhelming public opposition. If the elected

politicians are clearly not supporting the opinion of their constituents, who do they represent?

At the provincial level, we learned that developers who enjoyed big government contracts were also heavy contributors to many of the candidates, while the major fundraiser involved in the contributions was awarded a top patronage position. The same person was then charged with violations of the Elections Act. The extent of the scandal was then barred in the courts and conveniently removed from public scrutiny.

At the municipal level, I have sat in this very room when virtually 100% of a neighbourhood opposed a certain development, yet the development proceeded. Public hearings have become a charade. Every time a hearing is held on a disputable development, we can predict with great accuracy who will vote for its approval. The development always proceeds, the developer always gains, the affected neighbourhood always loses, and we have strip joints operating on the edge of schoolyards.

It should be obvious that we need an Elections Act which makes an elected official more accountable to that person's constituents and defends a candidate from undue influence from special interest contributors. We suggest the following:

1. Businesses and organizations should be specifically precluded from contributing to either a candidate or a party. Their money should be used to convince the electorate as to the validity of their interests and not to buy a politician nor to unduly influence their vote.

2. Only individual contributions from authorized voters should be permitted. The amount an individual can contribute should be restricted to avoid, to the extent possible, economic discrimination.

3. Election spending in a riding should be restricted to the amount raised in that riding.

4. An individual's eligibility to run in an election should be determined by his ability to get sufficient contributions to cover the administrative cost to have the person's name placed on the ballot.

5. There should be recorded votes in the legislatures to provide the voters with a better basis to evaluate the performance record of the politicians.

Please give these ideas your consideration.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr and Mrs Johannes. We will be able to allow one quick question. Mr Winner?

Mr Winner: I was intrigued by many of the points you so convincingly made.

The first concern was with the notion of impeachment of members elected. There was a concern expressed yesterday that if members are subject to impeachment during their term, they might feel hamstrung in that if they take an action it will obviously displease some of their constituents and please others, and those constituents that are displeased with the effect of this decision might seek to impeach the incumbent. So it would be a concern that perhaps the elected members would not be able to get the job done that they were elected to do if they had to be forever accountable to different sectors of their constituency during their term of office.

The only other point I would make in reference to the referendum is, it sounds like a marvellous idea and it probably is as close as we can come to direct democracy, but I wonder how Quebec would fare in a national referendum, simply because the Quebec votes are so heavily outweighed by the votes outside of Quebec but inside Canada.

Mr F. Johannes: Try again on the last part.

Mr Winner: The results might be skewed against Quebec, simply because Quebec only represents approximately one third of our national population. How could their aspirations be realized in a national referendum on our constitutional future?

Mr F. Johannes: I think you could follow the Australian procedure, in which each of the provinces must have 50% of the referendum. When the legislation is drawn up, the legislation will be drawn up to be passed through Canada. You will not have the diversification, the power struggles between the groups if it is drawn up for the good of all Canadians. I think Canadians recognize the legitimate concerns of Quebec as well as anybody; we have been told it a hundred times. But if Quebecers do not like it, they have a chance to deny its passage by 50% vote in their province, just the same as we can eliminate outrageous demands by Quebec by 50% refusal in our province.

Mr Winner: I see. Thanks very much.

Mr F. Johannes: By the way, we do not agree with impeaching any candidate. We just want him less influenced by special interest groups and we want him accountable to the voters.

Mr Winner: I do not think any member would disagree with that point of view.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr and Mrs Johannes.

VINCENT DI NORCIA

The Chair: We move to the next speaker, Vincent di Norcia.

Mr di Norcia: I would like to thank the Chairman of the committee for not only giving me the opportunity to present these remarks but also allowing me to come at a time when I would not give my students a break from class at the university. I do not think they thank you, however.

I am speaking as a private citizen. However, I teach social ethics and political philosophy and what I want to do is to some extent address what I see as misshapen questions and some of the values involved in the current debate about the country.

I think we need to ask the right questions. To paraphrase the Rolling Stones, "You can't always get what you want, but if you try real hard, you might find what you need." I think the real question is: What does Canada need? It is not: What does Quebec or Alberta or Ontario or Sudbury want?

Let me explain what Quebec wants, and this is based on my knowledge and my memory of documents going back to the Tremblay report, Options Québec, various reports in Quebec, including, although I have not seen it, except through the press, the Allaire report.

I think, to quote Daniel Johnson, Quebec wants "l'égalité et l'indépendance," both and more, and that is

the problem. If you ask people what they want, they give you wish lists, only limited by their imagination. It is like the "gimme more" of a spoilt child, and I do not only mean Quebec there. I think it is all over the country. That self-serving approach is ruining the country. It is not convincing rationally, because it is impossible, or morally, because it comes from passion and desire rather than sound judgement.

1050

As Allaire, the PQ and Bélanger-Campeau tell us, Quebec wants everything, and more if possible. It wants sovereignty, with some help from Canada, and that is absolutely madness, in my view; it wants independence, as Mr Parizeau said the other day, without paying the debt of Canada, debt it must accept; and it wants independence or sovereignty with economic links. It wants to determine its future itself, but with our help. It wants a European Community type of economic union with Canada instead of freer interprovincial trade. This does not compute.

Quebec rejects federalism but also seeks post-sovereignty, to use Mr Bourassa's word, "supranational" structures, equal institutions for Quebec and Canada. This would be an unworkable nightmare and much less democratic than the current system. Quebec's distemper is all too bourgeois, a limitless, middle-class craving for more, without losing all the old comforts. In sum, to misquote General de Gaulle, "Un Québec vraiment libre," free. Give us a break.

The Allaire report deems Canadian social policies like medicare, the pension plan, environmentalism, etc, to be centralist threats to Quebec's autonomy. Does this mean only the Quebec state has moral validity, only its powers? It sounds to me like Duplessis is still alive and doing very well, and in fact it was the PQ who put his statue back up.

Nor has Quebec made a moral case for independence. I do not see any serious injustice proven, anything on the scale of what is happening in other countries, such as in the Russian republics, in Quebec. As an English Canadian who is bilingual and indeed trilingual, who has travelled around, I do not see any case that I am stomping—in a bilingual institution, mind you—on the rights of the French in Quebec. I see all kinds of problems. We all have problems. We all have difficulties, terrible difficulties. But I do not feel the government of Canada is an oppressive government, preventing Quebec from realizing its future.

Therefore I cannot accept an argument based on what Quebec wants. If Quebec proceeds in the current direction, what will we, not just Quebec, get? Disaster. A sovereign Quebec may be free to run her own affairs, but the predictable outcomes look all too bleak.

There will be no fourth level of federalism, not if this Canadian has anything to do with it. I pay enough taxes already. We will not have equal Canadian and Quebec institutions. They are more unworkable than the current system. It is a dual majority system. It is dead to start with, and if it is executive, it is less democratic. For people in Quebec who correctly criticize the current system for its complexity, to propose an even more complex system is peculiar.

Canada will need a corridor to the Atlantic. Will we get it? Regions opposed to sovereignty inside Quebec need not remain in Quebec. Northern territories like James Bay, granted to Quebec in 1912, need not stay in Quebec. Canadian assets, like Spar Aerospace, Bell Canada, CNR, federal institutions, etc, need not stay in Quebec. Free access to Canadian firms need not be given the Caisse des dépôts, which already has major interests in Canadian firms like Canadian Pacific.

Canada-Quebec relations need rest only on formal diplomacy and treaties as with any other state. Quebec will need to pay at least \$80 billion debt. Quebec firms will need to work to gain access to Canada, and vice versa for us. Quebec unemployment rates, now high, will skyrocket. Quebec will need to negotiate her own trade deal with the United States and Mexico and perhaps Canada. Billions in Ottawa support for the Quebec economy including art—we give more to Quebec arts than the Quebec government—will dry up.

Both states, I think, will very likely face a serious recession, if not a depression, self-inflicted. Quebec will feel less pressure to clean up the environment. She is already one of the weakest provinces in the country in this respect. Cross-border pollutions will increase.

Unilinguality and intolerance, something which I detest, having grown up and seen enough of it in Toronto against people with names like mine, will grow needlessly. Immigration will go through the floor and the best will leave the country. I think that is absolutely clear.

We will have two criminal codes, and just look at the Americans to see what that means for crime. Instead of Europe's 1992 move to more integration, we will have more disintegration.

These outcomes I have put forward because they are at least as inevitable as sovereignty is said to be by Québécois who favour it. Concern about consequences, which is part of ethics and rationality, needs to take hold in Quebec and in Canada. Indeed we both should reflect on what Canada needs, including Quebec, including a bilingual Canada, a Quebec with the rights it needs to preserve her society.

At this point in history we face an incredibly turbulent and unpredictable world, economically and politically. Canada does not need more demands for power from the provinces, including this one. We do not need sovereign tribes of Indians or warring fiefdoms of prime ministers or city fathers or whoever. This is already one of the most decentralized federations in the world. Self-inflicted further divisions would constitute une vraie folie, madness.

People are naïve to think that particularist passions can maintain Canada as a strong and healthy society. Instead they work to fragment Canada to the point that there is no country. We need to reinforce our strengths: a sound economy; I would add bilingualism; ethnic immigrant rights of the kind we have tolerated to the point, to this day; an educated, strong and well-educated people; healthy people through medicare; a sustainable habitat through better environmental regulations; etc.

We need to nurture our common interests and values, our cultural and regional identities as a group, a mutually

supportive and co-operative group, not a constantly fighting bunch of prime ministers.

As a bilingual Canadian of Italian descent, an experienced traveller, a sometime resident of the United States and Europe, I maintain, and I think that is unarguable, that this is one of the best countries in the world. Why are we blowing it? I simply do not understand that.

I wait for an argument for Quebec. How are they going to be better off after we are all divided? In reality we all have only one choice, to hang together, to work together, to share our riches and build a strong country. No one else will do it for us in this world. That is it. That is the bottom line. We must clarify and strengthen Confederation and our commitment to Canada and clarify and strengthen our allegiance to the country, and not to Quebec, Alberta or Ontario.

By the way, I find it insulting to my intelligence and my probity that because I am an Ontarian, I support Canada. I am tired of hearing this either from Quebec or from the west. It seems to me across the country there are people who support their province and their country in the best way, and those who want a strong Canada are not necessarily regionalists from Ontario.

Now I am going to play a game here. Quebec says we should rethink federalism on the English Canadian side. Well, I will rethink federalism. Eliminate the provinces. Do we really need them? Eliminate four levels of government such as we have in this town. Eliminate four boards of education. Eliminate the higher taxes. Eliminate more net programs in our governments. Eliminate first ministers' conferences. Why not only have two levels of government—Ottawa, the national government, and about 30 to 40 regions? It would be simpler and it would be cheaper. I do not know that it would be better. I just say if you want to rethink the federation, then let's really rethink it. I think the kinds of ideas about sovereignty we are getting are at least 25 years old.

But this is too much rethinking. What Canada really needs is a stronger federation. A few small suggestions: The government of Canada should have the key international, legal, socioeconomic, technological and environmental powers needed for success in these difficult times. Canada should have ways of ensuring high educational, health care and environmental standards. Canada should have residual powers, not the provinces, so that Canada can adapt to change.

Provinces need only local powers, as was said 100 years ago—I think it was correct—like culture in Quebec. Each level must pay its own way. Maybe we should have separate taxes. Costly and confusing jurisdictional overlaps which are being attacked in Quebec and across the country by everybody, I think, must be clarified. We need more accountability of each division to its own citizens and that cannot be done under the current system. I am not sure we need very many shared powers and I would prefer federal paramountcy in most of them.

1100

One small point about the system: It is no longer an executive federal system. Since 1982 the Constitution can be changed by legislatures. Prime ministers are not neces-

sary. They have no power to do it anyway. It is in the act; I cannot remember the section. This seems to me to mean that any Legislature of the country can put forward an amendment and that can go, then, to all the other legislatures requisite within the three years and the amendment is passed.

No more conferences; no more talk shops. Mind you, obviously negotiations and discussions would have to be done to ensure that the law would be the same law, but in the United States the House and the Senate have committees to iron out matters like that.

I think this would make a much more efficient federation. We already have it, but we do not have public hearings like this—we need them. I think where there is deadlock, as there very likely will be—as the previous couple mentioned—some kind of reference to the people at that point, which might be a good way of breaking the deadlock.

In fine, Canadians need to live up to their highest social and democratic values. This is one of the best countries in the world. It can be better. The alternative, division and distrust, will only mean disaster morally and socially. If you try real hard, the Rolling Stones said, you might find what you need. The time has come for all of us—Québécois, Albertans, Ontarians, natives—to try real hard.

Mr Beer: We have had, in the presentations that we have received over the two weeks, this kind of dichotomy between a desire for a federal government that means something, that gives some sense to the country of Canada, and at the same time a feeling in many of the communities that people want to have more power, if you like, over their own lives, more control over what happens in their particular area. I can define that as small as a municipality or as large as a province or even a region.

It seems to me that this is where we always get caught and that perhaps when those in other parts of the country make the reference that you referred to about Ontarians always seeing themselves as Canadians, because after all we, in their view, control the federal Parliament, how do you see balancing, then, that desire for a strong country, a country with a central government that has some real power, and the equal desire of people to have control over their own lives and to feel that they can have a say in shaping those educational, health, social, whatever programs that are most important to them in their own communities?

Mr di Norcia: I think there are many levels of this. I will only address three. First, I think the party system is far too tight, and it includes all parties, including the NDP, everybody. There is just too much discipline and that undermines accountability to the people who elected the MPs. So all kinds of free votes with—this is just a small point—would make the—the government should only fall on serious matters. That small change right there would free up the system to allow more accountability of MPs to constituencies. It is not constitutional; there is nothing in the Constitution at all preventing it.

Second, with regard to the division of powers, I really agree with almost everybody who has looked at the Constitution,

that it is a mess and that it is extremely difficult for citizens even to know to whom to go. By the way, despite what I have said, what I am trying to do is say to Quebec that you cannot have everything, none of us can, but if you want to engage in an operation of clarifying the Constitution and making this a strong country, yes, with strong provinces—the 30 thing was just a logical point. Yes, with strong provinces. We do have to clarify. That would help citizens to say, “You’re responsible for education for the most part,” although I think we need national objectives of some kind. But I would not want the federal government running education systems, for that very reason. Yes, the federal government is responsible for interprovincial environmental flows or whatever. In some way or other that has to be done.

The third point I think has been addressed by many people in many different ways and I think, again, it is shared across the country, and that is that the citizens cannot be left out of the constitutional process. That is it.

One final point that has bothered me a great deal personally, as a bilingual Canadian of Italian descent, is the confusion between two Canadian languages. When people oppose English in Quebec or oppose French in Canada, they are opposing a Canadian language, they are opposing their own country. It is an extraordinarily suicidal form of racism.

Quando io parlo Italiano, when I speak Italian, non parlo Canadese, I am not speaking Canadian, I am speaking an immigrant's tongue, and I am proud to be a son of immigrants. It does not bother me. But the rights of another language, the rights of English in Italy, the rights of Italian in Canada, are not the same as the rights of Italian in Italy or the rights of English and French in Canada. I think that is another point on which there is a lot of confusion.

There are problems with managing bilingualism, many of them. I think it is in many ways overdone and too costly. That is a separate point. But the principle is we have two languages. I was just in Washington. It is great to be a Canadian there for many reasons, and one of them is that.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO DU GRAND SUDBURY INC

M. le Président : Je voudrais maintenant inviter, de l'ACFO du grand Sudbury, Michel Rodrigue.

M. M. Rodrigue : Bonjour. L'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario du grand Sudbury est heureuse d'avoir le privilège de comparaître devant le Comité spécial sur l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Comme vous le savez probablement, l'ACFO a été fondée en 1910 comme une association provinciale. Son objectif est de favoriser le développement et le bien-être des 500 000 Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens. Le conseil régional de Sudbury existe depuis près de 20 ans et a le même objectif dans le district de Sudbury.

Après des mois de débats publics sur l'avenir du pays, force nous est de constater que le Canada est à une étape délicate et déterminante face à son avenir. L'échec de l'accord du Lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, le

traitement réservé aux peuples autochtones, l'aliénation de l'Ouest et le mouvement souverainiste au Québec remettent en question l'existence même du Canada. Par nos propos, nous espérons apporter une contribution au débat actuel, soit les aspirations et les intérêts sociaux et économiques de tous les résidents de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération et la forme de Confédération qui est la plus apte à satisfaire les aspirations sociales et économiques des résidents de l'Ontario.

Nos valeurs communes : les Canadiennes et les Canadiens partagent un passé commun, cependant trop souvent celui-ci est incompris, méconnu ou tout simplement laissé pour compte.

Nous pourrions reconnaître certains jalons de notre histoire, par exemple, les peuples autochtones sont les premiers habitants du Canada. Le régime français existe de 1534 à 1760. Le régime anglais existe de 1760 à 1840 et enfin l'Acte d'union de 1840 constitue la première entente politique entre les deux peuples fondateurs. La loi constitutionnelle de 1867, l'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique, reconnaît implicitement l'existence de deux nations fondatrices. Et enfin, les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens habitent le territoire ontarien depuis 352 années. Ceci n'est pas une liste exhaustive, cependant le rôle historique et honorable que les trois communautés nationales ont joué leur procure un statut constitutionnel égal.

Pour aller rapidement à nos recommandations : la constitution doit reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone. De plus, la constitution doit souligner l'apport des néo-Canadiens et néo-Canadiennes. La constitution doit en outre traiter des droits suivants :

1110

Au sujet des droits des autochtones : reconnaître dans la constitution les droits ancestraux des peuples autochtones et le droit à l'autogestion de leurs territoires et de leurs institutions. Nous devons redresser les torts commis dans le passé à l'égard des peuples autochtones.

En ce qui a trait aux droits des néo-Canadiennes et néo-Canadiens : reconnaître l'apport des générations successives des néo-Canadiennes et néo-Canadiens au développement de l'une ou l'autre des trois communautés nationales ainsi que reconnaître l'apport de la diversité ethnoculturelle.

Des droits linguistiques et culturels : au Canada, en chasser le concept des deux nations fondatrices au niveau fédéral, ce qui retourne au bilinguisme et au biculturalisme officiels ; assurer l'égalité de traitement des deux minorités de langues officielles. À ce sujet, l'écart est présentement grand entre le traitement des minorités des langues officielles au Canada.

Par exemple, dans le domaine de l'éducation, seulement deux minorités de langues officielles possèdent des universités, soit trois au Québec et une au Nouveau-Brunswick. Les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens souhaitent ardemment, et ceci depuis déjà plusieurs années, la fondation d'un réseau universitaire de langue française en Ontario. Les mêmes demandes ont été faites en ce qui a trait à un réseau collégial homogène de langue française. À

ce sujet encore, nous sommes malheureusement témoins d'une disparité entre les minorités de langues officielles au Canada.

De plus, il nous faut garantir aux deux minorités de langues officielles l'autogestion de la gamme complète des établissements homogènes nécessaires à leur plein épanouissement.

Maintenant, en ce qui a trait à l'Ontario : selon nous, il faudrait déclarer l'égalité des statuts aux communautés francophones, anglophones et autochtones de l'Ontario. Il faudrait aussi garantir la promotion de la minorité franco-ontarienne et l'autogestion de la gamme complète des établissements homogènes nécessaires à son plein épanouissement.

Pour conclure, les propos de l'ACFO ont pour but le respect de l'histoire canadienne et l'essor des minorités de langues officielles et des peuples autochtones au Canada et en Ontario. Le développement futur des minorités de langues officielles et des peuples autochtones au Canada, et particulièrement en Ontario, devrait se faire sur une base de développement d'espaces de vie définis par les membres de la minorité.

Un espace de vie, ça pourrait se définir comme un ensemble de conditions qui sont jugées par une minorité de langue officielle ou autochtone comme susceptibles de favoriser le développement de cette minorité. Un exemple simple : un centre sociocommunitaire incluant des cliniques, une garderie, des services familiaux pour les francophones de la région de Chelmsford, par exemple, pourrait constituer l'un de ces espaces de vie.

Enfin, indépendamment du format constitutionnel qui sera retenu ou choisi ou négocié, ce format devra, selon nous, tenir compte des aspirations et des intérêts des communautés nationales. En conclusion, nous n'avons pas abordé beaucoup le sujet de ce que la constitution devrait être, mais plutôt ce qui devrait être contenu indépendamment de la structure à laquelle on va s'attacher. Je serais prêt à prendre des questions.

M. Beer : J'aimerais poser une question spécifique, à la page où vous parlez des droits linguistiques et culturels, et surtout sur 2(A)2.1, au Canada. Vous avez suggéré que nous enchâssions le concept des deux nations fondatrices au niveau fédéral, bilinguisme et biculturalisme officiels. En écoutant les représentants des autochtones, ils nous ont dit qu'ils trouvent un peu offensive cette idée des anglophones et des francophones, qu'il n'y a que deux nations fondatrices. En effet, ils parlent de la première nation, et donc dans la constitution il faut comprendre ce fait et on ne peut pas parler simplement des deux nations fondatrices.

Deuxièmement, ceux qu'on appelle les allophones : les néo-Canadiens acceptent facilement le concept du bilinguisme et la reconnaissance des deux langues mais trouvent que, quand on parle du biculturalisme, en effet ça a le sens d'exclure, disons, cette troisième force dans notre pays.

Alors, je me demande s'il n'y a peut-être pas une façon de parler du concept des nations fondatrices et aussi de l'appui des droits linguistiques sans nécessairement exclure — même si on ne veut pas le faire, les mots peuvent

quand même causer des problèmes comme ça. Alors, j'aimerais vos réflexions sur ces deux points.

M. M. Rodrigue : Parfait, je suis tout à fait d'accord. On pourrait parler de trois nations fondatrices. On l'a présenté comme ceci tout simplement parce qu'on a traité des différents groupes séparément. On ne voulait pas sous-entendre que l'un importait plus que l'autre. Je pense que les peuples autochtones ont été peut-être les grands perdants dans le débat constitutionnel des derniers deux ou trois siècles. Alors, effectivement, on doit présentement reconnaître qu'ils sont un des peuples, une des nations fondatrices.

Cependant, pourquoi on l'a présenté de cette façon ? Ce que j'entends, et je ne prétends pas être un expert des peuples autochtones, c'est qu'ils ne demandent pas nécessairement le même type d'administration, le même type d'accès à des services ou la même forme d'accès à des services que les deux minorités officielles traditionnelles, si on veut le regarder comme ça, avaient demandé. En fin de compte, ce qu'ils demandent c'est un peu une autogestion, c'est d'être capables de gérer leur propre milieu. Je parlais tout à l'heure d'un espace de vie. Ils veulent l'avoir, cet espace de vie parce qu'en ce moment on est près de les étouffer. Alors, c'est pour ça que je l'avais présenté comme ça, mais sur vos propos de fond, je suis tout à fait d'accord.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. My question deals with some of the activity which is going on in Quebec at this point in time. However one wants to characterize it, certainly it becomes evident that the status quo is no longer possible, but rather that there may be a move, a shift for more powers to the province of Quebec, not a separation as such but a distancing.

My question to you is, from your experience and through your organization, what would be the impact, in your opinion, on the interests and the rights of Franco-Ontarians, and francophones generally, in the event that there is this distancing, this moving away by Quebec from the rest of Canada?

Mr M. Rodrigue: I guess in that sense it is difficult to evaluate. What I would like to happen is possibly a situation where, as traditionally, Ontarians will look upon and be justified in keeping the concept of three national peoples, if you like. Concerning Quebec's éloignement, if you like, that may seem as a perception at this point, since they are far ahead in terms of thought process regarding the Constitution than where we as Ontarians or the rest of Canadians are.

So it seems to me that éloignement is not final and that it might be a good opportunity for us as Ontarians to speed up the process of evaluating how the Constitution has been good to Ontario and what Ontario requires in order to grow within Canada as it would be in the 21st century. So in terms of how it will impact on us, we see it as not necessarily negative but a positive at this point since it may speed up the process of indicating—and I think most provinces are doing the same thing—where we should be going, and there might be some new initiatives coming through at this point.

M. Winner : Nous avons écouté les francophones, les anglophones et aussi les autochtones et il me semble que personne n'a encore balancé tous les intérêts respectifs si bien que vous. Merci.

M. M. Rodrigue : Merci beaucoup.

STERLING CAMPBELL AND
LASALLE SECONDARY SCHOOL

The Chair: I would like at this point to give Sterling Campbell and some of the students from Lasalle Secondary School an opportunity to make a few comments to us. I gather they have a presentation that they would like to make. Mr Campbell, you can use any of the microphones down at that end.

Ms Brujic: Mr Chairman, on behalf of Lasalle Secondary School we would like to thank you with this small token of our appreciation.

The Chair: Our thanks on behalf of the committee to all of you from Lasalle and we look forward to our continuing discussions. We will no doubt hear more from you, we hope, and we invite you as students and staff at the school, as over the next number of weeks you discuss some of the issues that we were talking about here today, if you want to send us some of your views in writing, we would be happy to receive them. Thank you for the presentation.

1120

LE COLLECTIF POUR LE COLLÈGE DU NORD

The Chair: We proceed now to Jacques Michaud du Collectif pour le collège du Nord.

M. Michaud : Merci, Monsieur le Président. J'aimerais vous présenter Hélène Fontaine, qui est représentante du sous-comité sectoriel de la région de Sudbury.

Le Collectif pour le collège du Nord est heureux d'avoir l'occasion de faire connaître son point de vue sur le rôle que devrait jouer l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération canadienne. Le collectif désire remercier les membres du comité spécial, présidé par Tony Silipo, de s'être rendu à Sudbury afin d'entendre les opinions de la population de la région.

Mme Fontaine : On devrait d'abord vous expliquer pourquoi le collectif se prononce sur cette question constitutionnelle et le rôle de l'Ontario dans ce débat.

Tout d'abord le Collectif pour le collège du Nord estime que les Franco-Ontariens ont contribué de façon importante au développement de cette province, tant sur les plans politique, économique, social que culturel et ce depuis le tout début.

Selon le collectif, il est essentiel que les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes revendiquent et obtiennent leurs droits, qu'ils prennent la place qui leur revient dans cette province.

M. Michaud : Permettez-moi de vous expliquer le rôle, les objectifs, la mission que s'est donnée le collectif depuis ces débuts. Le Collectif pour le collège du Nord existe depuis deux ans et demi. Il est constitué de représentants de onze localités réparties sur l'ensemble du territoire du nord de l'Ontario.

Le collectif s'est donné comme objectif d'assurer la création d'un collège communautaire de langue française qui répondrait aux besoins particuliers de la collectivité franco-ontarienne. Afin d'obtenir l'appui et la contribution des divers secteurs de la communauté franco-ontarienne — ces secteurs étant économique, technique, social, culturel et autres — nous avons établi des sous-comités sectoriels dans chacune des onze régions du nord de l'Ontario. Les membres des sous-comités sectoriels sont appelés à se prononcer sur l'orientation de la programmation du futur collège de langue française. Ils proposent également une liste de candidatures en vue de la formation du conseil d'administration pour ce collège dans le Nord.

Mme Fontaine : Voici maintenant les objectifs du collectif :

1. Consolider le regroupement représentant les différents secteurs de la collectivité franco-ontarienne du nord de la province.

2. Examiner les besoins de cette communauté en ce qui a trait à la création d'un collège communautaire de langue française dans la région ; et

3. Communiquer les données pertinentes aux intervenants concernés.

Afin qu'un plus grand nombre d'intervenants se prononcent sur l'établissement éventuel de ce collège, le Collectif pour le collège du Nord a organisé trois colloques. Le dernier, qui a eu lieu à Timmins les 25 et 26 janvier dernier, a réuni plus de 250 personnes intéressées par la question.

Parmi les participants de ce colloque, il y avait des représentants de la communauté en général, des membres du personnel des collèges communautaires existants tels que des cadres, des enseignants et des employés de soutien, en plus des étudiants, des délégués des associations franco-ontariennes qui s'intéressent à ce dossier, des personnes-ressources, des fonctionnaires, des ministères provinciaux concernés et du secrétariat d'État ainsi que des personnalités politiques et du monde de l'éducation.

Ce colloque nous a permis de faire progresser le dossier. En attendant que le gouvernement provincial annonce d'ici peu la création d'un collège de langue française dans le Nord, nous avons recueilli près d'une cinquantaine de propositions et de recommandations touchant la programmation et l'orientation du collège. Ces recommandations seront transmises au ministère des Collèges et Universités.

M. Michaud : Nous aimerions vous présenter notre point de vue face à cette question constitutionnelle et le rôle que doit jouer l'Ontario.

D'abord, il faut reconnaître que les Franco-Ontariens et les Franco-Ontariennes ont une identité propre à eux, identité qui s'est forgée au fil des années depuis des générations, identité à laquelle nous tenons et dont nous sommes fiers.

Tout en faisant partie de l'entité ontarienne et de la grande mosaïque canadienne, nous tenons aussi à évoluer comme sous-groupe. Afin que ce sous-groupe puisse offrir à la province tout son potentiel, l'Ontario et le Canada doivent répondre à ces besoins particuliers.

Si on veut donner la chance à cette population d'évoluer sur tous les plans — et les plans peuvent être personnels, économiques, sociaux et autres — il faut reconnaître les particularités auxquelles elle tient. Parce que notre langue et notre culture font partie de notre propre identité, de notre être, il est essentiel que les gouvernements ontarien et fédéral prennent les mesures qui assurent à la collectivité franco-ontarienne son développement à part entière.

L'éducation est une première étape à cette évolution de population franco-ontarienne. Ainsi, le futur collège communautaire de langue française permettra d'offrir à cette clientèle une ambiance culturelle propre à son idéal.

C'est un début, mais qui aurait des répercussions bénéfiques à la suite ? Les étudiants et les étudiantes qui seront formés iront ensuite propager leurs connaissances et leurs expériences à l'ensemble de la communauté. Ainsi tout l'Ontario, et par le fait même notre pays le Canada, ne pourra qu'en tirer avantage sur tous les plans. Il ne pourra que mieux se développer.

Le Canada s'étant défini comme une nation bilingue et biculturelle, il doit maintenant faire preuve de sa sincérité. À ce chapitre, l'Ontario, la plus peuplée et la plus riche des provinces canadiennes, doit donner l'exemple. Elle doit donc reconnaître l'identité particulière des divers peuples qui la composent afin d'assurer au Canada une unité, un front commun. Par notre constitution on doit respecter ces peuples qui forment l'Ontario et le Canada.

En conclusion, si le Collectif pour le collège du Nord travaille avec autant d'ardeur depuis quelques années déjà à l'établissement d'un collège de langue française pour les arts appliqués et la technologie dans le nord de la province, c'est pour assurer une place au peuple franco-ontarien dans l'image pancanadienne. C'est pour que tous les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes aient la possibilité de participer pleinement au devenir de notre pays.

1130

M. le Président : Merci. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Mrs O'Neill, go ahead.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Thank you very much for coming forward. I did not realize how organized you were to this point. I have the privilege of having la Cité in my riding of Ottawa-Rideau, and if I have ever seen a celebration of education, it was the day on which that school opened. I do not know whether you were there.

Would you tell me, have you got some contact with the personnel at la Cité and/or Algonquin? And I have one small question from your brief, if I may.

Mr Michaud : As you know, in our system the networking is very important and it is made easy in knowing that the college system in the French-language sector will be divided between three bodies, la Cité collégiale being in existence already, the collège du Nord hopefully to open its doors in 1992 and the system that we are hoping to create for the southern part of Ontario.

It is very important for us to work at a network of accessibility programs in order to not duplicate the programs that will be put into place in our province. It is very important for us to create this link with la Cité collégiale and other community colleges that might be working at the

same end as we are. So yes, there is a link between la Cité collégiale, the group working at creating a college in southern Ontario and our group, le Collectif pour le collège du Nord.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Well, you are working with excellent professional people, as you know. Could you say a little bit for me about, I think I am reading it correctly, the board of governors, on page 2? Are you suggesting that you are to that point that you are already looking for candidates for your board of governors? Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr Michaud : That is right. There are 11 communities that take part in our organization. These 11 communities from northern Ontario have a subcommittee such as ours. Hélène Fontaine is a member. Each one of these subcommittees has representatives from existing colleges, high schools, private sectors in business as well as government organizations in their community. These people have coordinated their efforts so that they can suggest to the government, the Minister of Colleges and Universities, the people who should give a certain direction to this college. And these are the people who we will be submitting to the minister, Dr Richard Allen, on 25 February.

Mme Y. O'Neill : Bonne chance.

M. Michaud : Merci bien.

M. Beer : Nous avons aussi parlé hier de cette question, d'un collège communautaire. Est-ce que dans votre article vous prévoyez un centre comme la Cité collégiale, ou plutôt un collège avec ce qu'on appelle de multiples campus ? Comment est-ce que vous prévoyez le collège du Nord ?

M. Michaud : Je crois qu'il est assez difficile à ce point de déterminer au juste le modèle qu'on va suivre. Mais vous savez que la commission Bourdeau a recommandé certaines formules pour la création de ce collège. Il est certain que le Collectif pour le collège du Nord, son comité permanent, encourage énormément que le ministère des Collèges et Universités suive les recommandations de la commission Bourdeau. Pour ses recommandations, on indique bien qu'il devrait avoir un centre administratif possiblement composé de deux campus principaux et un nombre de campus satellites. On parle aussi beaucoup de l'éducation à distance. Vous savez que, ici dans le Nord, on a l'institution appelée Contact Nord qui pourrait venir aider à l'accessibilité de nos programmes dans le système collégial de langue française.

CERCLE DE RÉFLEXION SUR L'AVENIR DU CANADA

M. le Président : Je voudrais maintenant inviter le Cercle de réflexion sur l'avenir du Canada : Christiane Rabier, Gaëtan Gervais, Jean-Charles Cachon et Gaston Demers.

M. Cachon : Notre groupe a été formé de façon ad hoc en prévision de cette audience, il ne représente donc que les quatre personnes signataires. Nous avons décidé de réfléchir avec vous sur la situation constitutionnelle actuelle et sur l'avenir possible du Canada à la lumière de cette situation.

This group considers that it is necessary to rethink entirely, and I mean entirely, the Canadian constitutional

arrangement. It recommends the establishment of a true Confederation that would respect the socioeconomic and cultural particularisms of the constituent entities, which would be new, redefined entities that would replace the current 10-province system.

The creation of a true Confederation implies a new distribution of powers between the different levels of government.

I will now answer the first four questions of your document in English and my colleague Christiane Rabier will do so for the next four in the French language.

First of all, what are the values we share as Canadians?

We first think that Canadians have once and for all to agree about their past. Governments must play a leadership role in making this past known and understood by all Canadians.

Once and for all, we have to recognize that the native peoples were the first settlers in Canada, that the French regime lasted from 1534 to 1760 and that the British regime lasted from 1760 to 1840, at which time the Union Act constituted the first political arrangement between the two founding people, French and English. In 1867, the British North America Act, known as the Constitution Act for the so-called current Confederation, was implicitly recognizing the existence of the two founding nations. To finish on this point, we feel that neo-Canadians should be strongly encouraged to espouse the thesis of the two founding nations and also of the ancestral rights of the native peoples.

Second question: How can we secure our future in the international economy? We feel that this country should ensure equal opportunities to all. It should ensure accessibility to schooling and training to all, French Canadians like English Canadians, from kindergarten to university. It should recognize that the Franco-Ontarian minority has a right to difference and to its own institutions, whether social, economic or educational. It should encourage the fulfilment of the Franco-Ontarian minority. It should also make room for the Franco-Ontarian minority, thus allowing it to fully participate in the economy of the province and the country. Do not forget that there are a number of ties that this community can secure which nobody else can, particularly with the Francophonie and the rest of the francophone world, and this country and this current province can draw a lot from that. We do not think it is the case at the present time, because of lack of institutions, lack of a university, for example.

Third question: What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? We feel that we should have a true confederal regime in Canada. Normally, the roots of a Confederation are a group of independent nation states that join together for common goals. We may have a Confederation at this point, but we do not have independent or autonomous nation states and we have to reflect on that. Therefore we will have to proceed with the restructuring of entities within that new regime, that new Constitution.

Fourth question: How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? We first have to recognize the ancestral rights of aboriginal peoples in the Constitution itself. We must repair the harm done in the past to

these aboriginal peoples and the harm that is still being done right now. We have to recognize the right of aboriginal peoples to self-govern their territories and their institutions, and of course there will be a lot of details to be cleared out and discussed, but do not forget that we see this as part of the new political and geographical restructuring of the country within that new Confederation.

I will now let Christiane Rabier speak to you.

1140

Mme Rabier : Alors, à la cinquième question : quels sont les rôles du français et de l'anglais au Canada ? Nous considérons qu'il est nécessaire d'enchaîner le concept des deux nations fondatrices au niveau de ce nouvel agencement constitutionnel, c'est-à-dire essentiellement qu'on reconnaisse le bilinguisme officiel et le biculturalisme officiel parce que jusqu'à présent c'est beaucoup plus le bilinguisme qui a prévalu au plan officiel et non pas le biculturalisme.

Il s'agit aussi de reconnaître la part des nouveaux arrivants, des néo-Canadiens, en leur reconnaissant des privilèges, donc dans ce nouvel agencement constitutionnel, et il s'agit aussi de garantir aux deux minorités officielles du Canada, les anglophones et les francophones, l'octogestion de la gamme complète des institutions homogènes qui sont absolument nécessaires à l'épanouissement des minorités, que ce soit donc les minorités anglaises au Québec ou les minorités françaises hors Québec.

Essentiellement, ce que les francophones demandent en somme c'est du rattrapage, c'est de faire du rattrapage par rapport à ce dont les anglophones jouissent en tant que minorité au Québec, avoir donc tout un réseau d'écoles, de la maternelle jusqu'à l'université essentiellement en français.

La sixième question : quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada ? Il faut reconnaître que le Québec est le foyer de la nation canadienne-française, on ne peut pas échapper à cette réalité-là, il l'a été d'une façon historique et le Québec a encore un rôle à jouer dans ce nouvel agencement constitutionnel qui est à venir. Nous pensons qu'il est nécessaire d'instaurer un système suffisamment flexible. Le problème c'est que généralement on a tendance, pour reprendre un peu la réflexion, le mot de Daniel Johnson, l'ancien premier ministre du Québec : «Les constitutions sont faites pour les hommes et non pas les hommes pour les constitutions». En d'autres termes, les constitutions doivent toujours s'adapter à la nouvelle réalité.

Septièmement : quelle est la place de l'Ouest, du Nord et de la région de l'Atlantique ? Si on regarde un peu ce qui s'est passé depuis plusieurs décennies, on s'aperçoit que au Canada, finalement, dans la mentalité des gens il s'est créé un concept de régions et donc on propose un nouvel agencement constitutionnel basé sur les cinq entités régionales traditionnelles, essentiellement la Colombie-Britannique, les Prairies, l'Ontario, le Québec et l'Atlantique.

En ce qui concerne le Nord, les territoires du Nord-Ouest et le Yukon, essentiellement à cause de la particularité de ces deux territoires, à cause de la présence des populations autochtones, inuit ou amérindiennes, il est évident que le statut de ces territoires-là, le statut du Nord

d'une façon générale, du nord du Canada devrait être défini en consultations avec les populations autochtones.

Huitièmement : que veut l'Ontario ? À la dernière question du document qui nous avait été présenté, nous répondons qu'il faut créer pour le 21^{ème} siècle un Ontario qui est prospère — il l'a toujours été, il faut conserver cette prospérité ; un Ontario tolérant, un Ontario donc qui est capable d'affronter les défis du 21^{ème} siècle ; un Ontario qui continue à jouer un rôle de leadership, qui assume ce rôle de leadership dans le débat constitutionnel au Canada ; un Ontario qui respecte les droits des autochtones à l'autogestion et au contrôle de leurs territoires parce que, historiquement parlant, les autochtones ont toujours été oubliés dans le processus constitutionnel ; un Ontario qui respecte aussi le principe des deux peuples fondateurs, les Anglais et les Français ; et un Ontario qui accueille les néo-Canadiens et qui les incite à épouser les principes fondamentaux de la Confédération en se joignant à l'un ou à l'autre des deux groupes fondateurs.

Essentiellement c'est ça notre vision de l'Ontario dans le débat constitutionnel, dans le nouveau processus constitutionnel.

M. le Président : Merci. Il y a des questions ?

Mr Martin: You made a wonderful presentation, obviously have put some great thought into pulling it together and that is reflected in the way that it has come out. I am struggling to put it into some context and trying to imagine how much potential it has to get out there and actually become fact.

This morning we heard some wonderful presentations from people, and the more I hear the presentations, the more I begin to feel that there is some hope, that there is a place where we can all come to some accommodation and Canada can continue to evolve. Mr Rodriguez suggested that this was simply the beginning of a dialogue. It was the first part of a forum and at this level we are simply listening to how people are feeling and not putting too much of the logistics together. And then we—

The Chair: We are running a bit short on time.

Mr Martin: Okay.

The Chair: Can we just get to the question, please?

Mr Martin: And then as well, we heard the history of Canada, and I think we are all pretty much aware of that. I guess what I am sensing at this point is we are stuck between two competing forces, one that wants to do what you have suggested here and move ahead and dialogue; another that wants us to get at it immediately because, if we do not, the country will be torn apart. Is there any resolution to that, those who are creating all kinds of obstacles to our coming together and moving ahead and what you want to do here and the time that is required?

Mr Cachon: I cannot embrace blocked situations in any way. I have been involved in all kinds of conflicts, whether labour or other kinds, and I think there is always a place at some point in time for negotiation and discussion, when all the parties are willing to trust each other and to speak to each other with honesty. I do not think there is anybody around this table who would disagree with that,

and I doubt also that there are Canadians who disagree with the idea of dialogue.

In fact, if you look at the current political situation in Quebec, it is fairly clear that even the staunchest indépendantistes are ready to say that they are open for business in any other thing but what they call sovereignty. One of our questions was in fact, are we against some kind of sovereignty, which would be maybe closer to what Quebec wants, for Ontario? Would people in the west, in the Prairies, not be interested in some kind of sovereignty over a number of jurisdictions? Would we not be happy to have much less conflict on various kinds of jurisdictions, whether they are economic or social or others? Are we not tired and sick of fighting for transfers and so on in the education area and the social areas? I think that there is a lot that we want in common, maybe not as provinces, but as regions.

1150

Mr Beer: I would just like to take the opportunity at this point to perhaps aid our collective memory and to note that among his other attributes, Gaston Demers was the provincial member of the Legislature for Nickel Belt, a Progressive Conservative member, from 1967 to 1971. I say that partly because I think it is good to see, Gaston, that you are still very much involved and have come forward this morning, but second, and perhaps even more important, we forget sometimes the progress that we have made in this province and in this country in the whole area of linguistic rights. As a rather young and green civil servant freshly out of university, I can remember working with Gaston on a whole series of initiatives, particularly at that time in the educational area, and while many people were involved in what was to come in the 1970s and 1980s, I think one wants to say thank you, Gaston, for all that you did back in that early time.

Mr Demers: We should add that we did not win them all. And it was 1963 to 1971, not 1967.

Mr Beer: Sorry.

Mr Demers: But that is all right. You too are getting old.

M. le Président : J'ai une question. De temps en temps je me permets, en tant que Président, de poser une question.

J'ai quelque chose que je voudrais clarifier. Vous avez dit que la nouvelle constitution doit s'adapter à la nouvelle réalité, et il y a quelque chose vers la fin de votre présentation qui me donne quelques problèmes et j'espère que j'ai mal compris. Vous dites, en ce qui concerne les néo-Canadiens, qu'ils doivent se joindre à l'un des deux peuples fondateurs. Dans un sens ça peut donner l'idée de certaines attitudes d'assimilation, et je voudrais que vous clarifiiez votre position là-dessus. Est-ce que j'ai bien ou mal compris vos commentaires ?

Mme Rabier : Okay, je vais clarifier. Ce qu'on veut dire par là, c'est que les groupes néo-canadiens contribuent énormément au pays, mais qu'à un certain moment ces groupes-là conservent une partie de leur héritage culturel mais en même temps deviennent des Canadiens. Donc, par ce fait même, ils deviennent soit des Canadiens francophones,

soit des Canadiens anglophones. C'est dans ce sens-là qu'on veut le dire.

M. le Président : Il y aura certainement d'autres qui diront qu'ils ne deviendront ni l'un ni l'autre.

Mme Rabier : Mais on ne peut pas être —

M. le Président : Mais on continuera à en parler.

Mme Rabier : Exactement. Mais le point qu'on veut faire là c'est que chaque immigrant est un apport énorme au pays mais il ne peut pas rester immigrant toute sa vie et pour toutes les générations à venir. C'est ça qu'on veut dire.

M. le Président : Merci. Il y a d'autres questions mais il faut passer au suivant. Donc, merci bien.

We are going to pause just a couple of seconds to allow the students—I gather their bus is waiting, so we are going to allow them to leave. While that is happening, if I could indicate that we have four other people who have asked to be able to speak to us, and again, as we tend to do towards the end of the block of time that we have, I think that the only way we are going to be able to do that is by asking those four individuals if they would please keep their comments to about five minutes. We are a little bit more tight for time than we had hoped to be, but that is the reality, which is obviously also good because it means that there is a fair bit of interest. So if I could ask the four individuals to keep their comments to about five minutes, then I would invite Ernie Checkeris to come forward.

ERNIE CHECKERIS

Mr Checkeris: Needless to say, Mr Chairman, I am not prepared. I had tried to get on your task force some time ago and sort of gave up, and there was some confusion with respect to which telephone number I was supposed to call. At any rate, I thank you very much for the opportunity.

I am of Greek parents. They were refugees from the Turkish nationalistic knee-jerk that took place at the end of the last century and arrived as ignorant refugees in Canada, could not read or write their own language and learned to read and write in a simple way in English.

My father established a business as a typical Greek, became a restaurateur, and he raised his sons and enjoyed this country of ours. I think I can speak for the sons of many immigrants who are put in the peculiar position of having to learn a third language, if you like, as well as carrying their own culture with them.

My parents were very proud to be Canadians. They never went back to visit. They could not go back to Turkey. They never visited Greece. They felt that this was their land, and it became my land and my brothers' land. I am concerned about the nation called Canada, because it was good to me.

Our parents taught us, because they were peasant farmers, that you do not just take from the land, you put something back. So my brothers and I have worked hard for Canada. I served in the navy. I became a businessman in northern Ontario and I have retired subsequently. I have been a school trustee for 43 years and I have enjoyed the opportunity to serve my country in that way and I want

nothing else to do but do that, because I believe the real future we have rests in our kids, and that is what we are really talking about today. The Greek saying is, "We begin digging our grave when we are born and we hope we make it comfortable by the time we die." So the beginning is really the beginning of the end.

My concern is that we do not have a country here. We do not have a country. We have 10 nations under one flag, and two territories that want to become nations too, I suppose. Somehow or other we have to develop an attitude that says that we are Canadians.

We have two official languages, and that is okay. We are a multicultural group of people, various kinds of people, and we are receiving more and more all the time. How do we bring these people together? I suggest to you that as provincial politicians you had better take a damn good look at your attitude towards Canada as a whole, not the province of Ontario.

Ontario has been very fortunate. The Scots and the Brits and the Irish and whoever, the Poles and Italians and Greeks who built this province have left a pretty good legacy, if we use it right.

I guess a classic example, because it is current and people are not happy about it, is the GST. Why the GST? I was in business. I manufactured. I had to pay the federal manufacturing sales tax, and if I were in that position today, wanting to export outside the country, I would not want to have that 13%, 14% or 15% tagged on to my costs. I would rather do it another way. But instead of doing it as a nation, we compelled the federal government, which is in charge of a hell of a big deficit, to force the thing upon us. Instead of being, as provincial premiers, responsible to the nation as well as their provinces, they fought the federal government. This is only a classic example because it is new and we can remember it well.

Would it not have been better if the premiers had said, "Look, we have a deficit of several billions. We have to get rid of that deficit. Why don't we work it together? Why don't we collect it for you?" instead of having the federal government create a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy to collect it? Tag it on to your particular sales tax, pay a percentage to the government, keep a percentage for yourself for operations costs. No, no, no. We cannot do that. We are provincial first, Canadians second.

Yet we want those transfer payments. Where do people think transfer payments come from, anyway? Out of the air? They are not apples. We do not pick them. We have to act as a federal organization.

Sure, it is a Confederation. If it is going to be a Confederation and continue to be a Confederation, it has to recognize two things. One is that the provinces are going to be different. It is obvious. The provinces have certain rights and certain desires. Let's negotiate them under that light. Let's talk talk.

I ran a business with 40-some-odd people. Nobody came into my office and threatened me by saying, "If you don't do it this way, Ernie, I'm going to quit," because it was automatic they were gone. But if they came into my office and said, "Hey, I've got an idea here that will help the company. There's something that doesn't work well for

the company and we're losing money on it. Let's sit down and talk about it," we talked about it, because it was good for the company.

The company in this particular case is called Canada, and if we are not prepared to fight, if we are not prepared to argue, if we are not prepared to talk talk, then I am afraid it is going to go down the drain. That seems to be the problem. That is why people get their hackles up when someone, a Premier or a commission or a province says, "This is what I demand, and if I don't get it I am going to hold a referendum and I'm going to leave." Boy, I have great difficulty restraining myself from saying, "Hey, buddy. Go."

1200

The concern I have is that we are not prepared to accept that kind of talk and sit down. Meech Lake, with its veto, was a crazy situation. God, do you not know what a veto means? I can give you a classic example, of a nation called Cyprus. When the British, the French, the Russians and the Americans left the Cypriots with a Constitution that provided for a veto for one eighth of the people who lived in that nation who were Turks, they met once as a Parliament. They had a democratic election. Everybody was happy: "Democracy has arrived in Cyprus." They sat down in the House of Parliament, modelled after the British system, and said, "We will now be democratic and we will administer this country fairly and equally." The first proposition that was put was a money bill, for customs, excise, income taxes, so forth and so on, the grease, if you like, to operate government. What happened? It was vetoed and they have never met since and they have never talked since. Now we have a green line there and we have UN troops keeping these two peoples apart because they just cannot talk. It does not matter who proposes what. If I do not like it, I veto it.

Vetoes do not work. Talk talk does. And it requires something I believe we were lacking in Canada. People are not prepared to face the truth. They are not prepared to be fair. They are not prepared to compromise. They are not prepared to submerge some of their interests and become a nation. So I am quite concerned about my country called Canada.

Ontario, the engine of Canada, is a strong province and I would hope would speak strongly in favour of talk talk, rather than go away. I do not want Quebec to change. I was talking to my friend Gaston Demers earlier. We meet quite often in Quebec City. I would never want Quebec City to change. I want it to become even more francophone. It puts me in the peculiar position of leaving Ontario and visiting a province that is different from mine, and I enjoy the difference. I enjoy the Gallic attitude towards life. I do not want them to change; it is the last thing I want them to do. I want them to remain, if they will, but I am not prepared to take a threat that says, "I'm going to leave if I don't get what I want." Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Checkeris.

WANDA FLIS

The Chair: I will move on to Wanda Flis.

Miss Flis: Good afternoon. I come before you as an average loyal Canadian who, as a young girl, made her two brothers stand at attention whenever the national anthem, O Canada, was played on the radio before Foster Hewitt's Hockey Night in Canada. I felt a thrill of pride whenever I heard the words "our home and native land, the true north strong and free." I shall always remain a loyal Canadian, but my faith in the integrity, the strength, the fairness of our government has been sorely tried and assailed by its unjust and divisive policies, by its implicit acceptance of Quebec's gospel, "I am a Québécois first and a Canadian second." Should it not be, "I am a Canadian who happens to live in Quebec"?

I am not well versed in the jargon of politicians. I am not skilled at using words with double entendre, so I speak to you in terms that come from me, the innermost of my Canadian heart: *Mon pays, il y a longtemps que je t'aime.*

I feel that the main problem facing Canada as well as Ontario today is three-dimensional: to restore and limit government to its true function; to deal with the mounting deficit that was brought about by irresponsible spending on unnecessary programs that undermine personal responsibility, initiative and competitiveness; and to encourage the development of a nation of self-reliant, self-motivated Canadians.

The state, by offering so-called protection, often done to assure re-election and to buy votes under the guise of social safety nets, has become more and more responsible for all aspects of an individual's life: his job, his education, his retraining, his lack of self-control and, yes, even his failures.

Many have gladly surrendered the responsibility for themselves and have come to regard the state as the great provider of all things. This has resulted in the growth and proliferation of government programs and agencies, to the point where it is now the largest employer in the country, and has created perhaps a nation of deliberate, contented underachievers. Therefore, I think we need leaders who will restore government to its true function, and in my simple terms it is to provide a safe environment free from physical and chemical assaults, where justice and equality of opportunity prevail and where each individual is free to determine and shape his success by the amount of personal effort and dedication he is willing and ready to contribute.

Official bilingualism, the two founding nations, multiculturalism, are very divisive and therefore should not be supported. The British North America Act recognized the French factor by making provisions for the use of French in the federal Parliament and in the courts. There is no need to have French used in every government-related department across the nation. Why do we need a commissioner of official languages? Why are there no anglophone offices of anglophone affairs? One province has already made a mockery of bilingualism, and nothing has been done. Pay equity is also a mockery when French-speaking employees in Ottawa are paid more. Language, and not excellence of work and performance, has become the criterion for employment. Francophones, anglophones,

allophones, neophones are words that segregate and divide. They certainly do not unite us Canadians.

Canada has been built by successive waves of immigration from various parts of the so-called Old World. The early French settlers came here as loyal subjects of the French king. They were working for him, so to speak, as colonists. When their king abandoned them, when he ceded them to Britain in the Treaty of Paris, the colonists were free to make a conscious choice. Article 4 of the Treaty of Paris guaranteed the French inhabitants the opportunity "to retire with all safety and freedom" if they did not wish to remain in British-held territory. Some 4,000 to 5,000 returned at the expense of the British government, so that none needed to remain for the lack of means to travel. Those who remained, therefore, were ready to accept their new status as undifferentiated subjects. They accepted the laws, the institutions, the limitations of the practice of their religion, as far as the then laws of Great Britain permitted. The British government was more than generous and tolerant in its administration.

Furthermore, on 11 March 1865, at the Confederation debates which resulted in the BNA Act, the combined assembly voted 91 to 33 under the rule of the double majority to accept the principles and objectives of Confederation. By that vote, the parliamentary representatives of French Canada reaffirmed their allegiance to an undifferentiated citizenship. The fact that the French were here earlier than the others should not make them better and more privileged citizens of Canada. They are just one of the many groups who founded and developed a specific area of Canada.

Canada is part of a new world, a new country where people saw new opportunities and the chance to escape the often oppressive regimes and caste-like societies of the Old World. Canada's freedom, Canada's tolerance, allowed them to practise and to carry on their different ethnic traditions, language among them. But many of these ethnic groups will readily agree that this preservation should be done by the people themselves and at their own expense. To do it otherwise is not logical nor fair. Money and laws do not preserve culture, for the more laws, the less justice. And money can only preserve the outside trappings and not the personal desire and need to be conscious of one's ethnic origin. Primary allegiance is given to Canada. If anything, Canadianism and not multiculturalism should be propagated. For example, why can we not have historical figures and not the Queen on our coins? I think that Canadianism should be propagated.

The Chair: Miss Flis, if you would sum up, please.

Miss Flis: All right. The aboriginal peoples need to be taken into consideration. I will not go into the sharing of powers; I leave that to the experts. Granted, times change, and it is time to take a long, hard look at the Constitution. However, certain principles remain timeless, and because of their innate wisdom I hope they are not overlooked. Unity is one, not two. A house divided cannot stand. The whole is greater than the parts. Laws do not preserve culture, people do. The more laws, the less justice.

1210

The Chair: Thank you, Miss Flis. There are a number of points that you made which I am sure many members of the committee would like to get into a discussion with you about, but time unfortunately does not permit us to do that.

Tom Taylor? Is Mr Taylor here? All right. And George Cast?

GEORGE CAST

Mr Cast: Mr Chairman, members of the select committee, good morning. My name is George Cast. I am a resident of Valley East, Ontario. I am fortunate to be here today, due to the lack of notice that has been given to the people, the same problem I spoke about when I came for the companion resolution after Meech. People are ill-informed. I phoned the office of my MPP, Shelley Martel, just the other day when I heard about your being here to find out a bit about it. They had a really hard time giving me anything on it. I had to do the phoning myself through the phone numbers through Toronto and such. Her office had nothing concrete. I gave them all day, showed up later—very poor information, a couple of press releases twice in the Sudbury Star, little ones.

I do not know what our press is doing. They have to have a release. The press in our community is at terrible fault here for getting the information out and getting the people involved. They have a bit of responsibility as well. You get more notice for a death. At least you get it printed every day for a while. Or a notice of dissolving a partnership; we get this every day for a while. You can laugh. This is true.

This committee is built on a farce. The time is ridiculous here. Come election time, gee, I will hear from my member of Parliament. God, she is at my door, she is ringing me on the phone, I see her at the barbecue. God, she is getting her hair done; there is a crowd around and the press is there. We do not have a problem getting to the people when it comes to getting ourselves elected here, but we really have a problem getting out to our constituents over the rebuilding of our country. It is obvious. The groups come up, they are prepared. They were there prepared for Meech Lake. They were notified and invited to Meech Lake. They were invited to the companion resolution. They just had to dust off their résumés and kind of just make a couple of alterations. But the citizens have not. We have not been given reasonable notice or reasonable time allotment to appear before you.

This also applies at the federal level. Mr Rodriguez, I am glad you are here today. I phoned your office over the Spicer commission. They did not know the 1-800 number. He had to look it up for me. I got it before he got back to me the next day. They had no particulars. I will gladly address that with you after, if you like. So on all levels the government is really at fault for getting this out to the people.

Regardless of the time schedule for other provinces, Ontario can take the proper time for this process. Canada will wait. We do not have to answer an ultimatum from some other province. When it comes to the committee, you can understand why some people would not be here, besides

improper notice. We had a lot more up here, now that the students are gone, for the companion resolution. Although it was a small ad, a few more ads than we had for this one. And if the press remembers, it was quite full in here with adults and people with presentations. Unfortunately, I could see those people being disheartened. I am not sure how many of you elected officials were—could I have a raise of hands of the ones who were elected who voted for the companion resolution who are here, who are MPPs? Just one voted for it?

The Chair: There are a number of new members on the committee.

Mr Cast: A number of new members, okay. I apologize for you, that hopefully you have more in mind to deal with the people than your predecessors had because most of Ontario—it was obvious through that committee—that had presented to that committee were opposed to the companion resolution. Our House of assembly goes back and votes 95-10 in favour. Of course, they did not make a big deal of putting that knowledge out, and they gave for the reason that the people did not have time, they did not get to enough people. Well, this committee has less time, or no more time than that committee did. What makes them think that they can get a better cross-section of citizens, I do not know. The excuse for time, it should go back and redo it. Give the citizens a chance to speak.

As a Canadian, just to touch on a few of the points, I have had one night to kind of try to fight to get one of these discussion papers from an MP's office, which was an all-day session. So by the time I got it last night as their office closed, it did not give me a lot of time to go through the points. But as a Canadian, I feel we value our freedom of speech and expression through our elected officials. Elections—we get the freedom to elect, but geez, our officials shortly after forget that. We do not get the freedom of expression. They do not come back to the people. This is the largest issue that has come up since I have been born—the restructuring of a country, of your province. I do not get any phone calls. I do not get the knocks at the door. They are not out there trying to reach us. They do not want to know. They are out busy speaking their own minds and their party line.

I hope that we keep our values, such as our social safety nets, our health care, our welfare, our UIC. We value the right to speak the language of our choice. There is no place in Canada for Quebec's Bill 101 and Bill 178. To do with our future in the international economy, it needs to be protected, I feel, much as it says in the report, through the education, proper resource management, research and development. These have all been promised so many times, but they have not come through. We have not seen the amount of money we need allocated to, especially, education to help us cope with the free trade issues.

I feel a central government is important, but again, as many people have said, especially the people coming up on their own, citizens, we need a revamping of our system: how the federal relates to the provinces; our tax systems need to be overhauled.

On the issue of aboriginal peoples, I believe they should have their form of self-government and I believe the government should settle their land claims quickly. They have been dragging their feet since the beginning of this country—a little haste to get this accomplished.

Back to the languages, I do not see any problem with provinces setting what their official language is, but you cannot tell people what to put on their signs, you cannot tell kids what language to use in the playgrounds. The basic rules are there. Other than Quebec's problem, as I say, Bill 101 and Bill 178, I do not really see us having a language problem. If Quebec cannot see eye to eye with the rest of the country on these issues, then it will have to make a decision, but in Ontario we have to decide what we feel is right for our country as a whole—our values, our freedom of expression, free speech, the social things.

My main point is that we just have not had time, the citizens, as you can tell by the erratic setup of this little speech, which I basically had to put together while waiting. We have not had time and I really hope that this committee will go back and tell the assembly that Canadians, but especially we in Ontario, would like time to have our say. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Cast. Let me just say on that point, because you spent a great deal of your time talking to us about time, we realize that the time lines that we are working under for the interim report are shorter than we would have preferred, but we want to stress that this is for us the first stage of our work and that we have been hearing so far from a very good cross-section of people in the places that we have stopped, and we do have a full list of people to talk to us this afternoon and this evening here in Sudbury.

But we are the first to acknowledge that much more discussion needs to happen and our mandate does not end until the end of June. What we are supposed to do by the end of March is put together an interim report. We will then be looking at how we can structure the discussions in the second stage so as to involve as many people as we possibly can. So we are quite conscious of the points that you are making and we are looking at ways to ensure that.

Mr Cast: Yes, I see that, but June just does not cut it. Look at the time that Quebec has given to its people. We have three million more people than they do and they have far more time that they have already addressed to their issues. What is with Ontario? We get four months to put it all together.

The Chair: Well, that is the time line of the committee.

Mr Cast: That is my point.

The Chair: That is not necessarily the time of the whole process. Obviously the discussions will continue way beyond our mandate as a committee.

Mr Cast: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I think with that then we will recess at this point until 3 o'clock this afternoon, when we will start the afternoon session.

The committee recessed at 1221.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1509.

SUDBURY AND DISTRICT
ASSOCIATION FOR ENGLISH RIGHTS

The Chair: First is Bill Stewart from the Sudbury and District Association for English Rights.

Mr Stewart: Let me say at the outset I am pleased that the province of Ontario is going to listen to the common folk. I am, however, sceptical that from the political point of view this is nothing but window dressing. However, since we are here and since a journey of a thousand miles starts with the first step, let us take the first step right now.

By way of introduction, I am 70 years old and a confirmed optimist, an electrician by trade and a construction one at that. I have worked at Come by Chance, Newfoundland, and Powell River, BC, and many, many places in between. I have not worked in the province of Quebec; my interprovincial licence is not accepted there. It should be noted, however, that all other provinces accept the Quebec licence.

I have spoken French since the age of six. I spent four years as an air gunner in the Second World War and was decorated by the King of England and the Queen of the Netherlands. I ran for member of Parliament in the Nickel Belt riding, Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, 1955. Active in union mining circles, I was steward, chief steward, vice-president of 17,000 miners, compensation and welfare officer, and I held other posts. I organized the famous or infamous John Diefenbaker demonstration at Chelmsford in 1958. That is enough about me.

I am going to give you some of the local history here. Sudbury and district, it could be said, was the model for all of Canada to emulate. Blessed with nickel and copper ore deposits, mining companies sank shafts and built processing plants, this in an era of heavy manual work. People came from all over Canada and, if they were in good health and weighed 145 pounds and more, went to work. The ethnic peoples of our land were particularly here in large numbers. They built churches and recreation halls and kept their cultures alive and well.

The Canadian Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers organized the nickel workers, and these ethnic people were the backbone of that union. Your workplace then was just as safe as you and your partner could make it. Expressions such as "stubble jumper," "herring choker," "limey," "Frenchie," were used not in a derogatory manner, but in a manner that was acceptable to the person we gave it to. A term perhaps would be affectionate. Yes, Sudbury and district was truly a place to be. To all intents and purposes, harmony reigned supreme and all people contributed their share.

From a personal point of view, when my oldest child was ready for school, I enrolled her in an all-French school. All went well until I discovered that along with French she was saying the beads and adopting values not acceptable to me. She then went to a public school and

majoried in French and has taught French in a French high school.

Things changed drastically in Sudbury for two reasons. First, the mining industry mechanized and the output per man more than multiplied by 10. The other major volcano in this land was when Lester Pearson made Canada bilingual and Quebec made its province unilingually French in 1967.

The other legislative restrictions on the non-French in Quebec added fuel to that fire, and Ontario put another log on the fire by the French Language Services Act. Suddenly, one segment of our society has a monopoly on public service jobs and the service jobs in the private sector as well. "Must be bilingual" became the order of the day, and to this date, bilingual means mother tongue French, and make no mistake about that.

This is not acceptable in this non-French-majority province. They make up about 5.6% of the population, and that is just not acceptable. Promotions based on bilingualism, not ability, are not acceptable. Promotions in the armed forces above a certain level if you are not bilingual are not acceptable. I was a flying officer and that had nothing to do with whether I spoke French, and this is causing the friction here. McDonald's started a fast-food and I talked to the woman. She proudly told me she had 22 bilingual people there, but I asked her how many could speak only English and she said, "None."

The following is what I believe must happen. À part cela, je veux dire que je parle français tout aussi bien que je parle anglais, mais je vais parler anglais ici. I just wanted to make sure you understand that I could speak French.

The following is what I believe must happen, based on an intimate knowledge of the forces driving the ordinary French person. Quebec must separate and the sooner the better. Only an imbecile would not know that a Quebec politician must find, between dinner and supper, another set of demands to ask English Canada. History tells us that no two nations and no two cultures ever survived; they always separate. I will give you a couple of examples: Norway and Sweden, India and Pakistan. You think we are going to be any different? No way, and the sooner the better.

I pray every night. I am not a very religious man but I do pray. I pray every night that they do separate, and the reason for that is so that the rest of us can get together and have a united, prosperous Canada, instead of the whining that has gone on for the 70 years I have lived in this land. French Canada cannot any longer expect civil service jobs as a monopoly and the service jobs outside of the public service can no longer be the sole property of the French. It is not going to work that way. No, the free ride is over.

I will give you a classic example. I come from Chelmsford. The non-French make up 38% of the population. The township workforce is 54 to 4. The public library is 10 French, 0 anglais. In the post office, c'est

4 français, 0 anglais, 4 French, 0 English. I am not saying something here that I did not go to council with. I told them that we pay the taxes and we are entitled to, as the French believe they are entitled to, jobs. I did not get very far, I might add.

In conclusion, I am going to list the personal injustices that happened to my family. I have a son, Scott, an electrician like myself. He applied for a job at Laurentian Hospital. They had a competition and I am proud to say that he finished on top. He was awarded the job and he was on cloud nine. Four days later, they called him up and said, "Scott, you don't qualify." Guess why? Because Scott cannot speak French as well as I can. This was an English, Protestant hospital that was founded by the English. A little digging found out that the supervisor was French and the other two people working there were French. That is not going to keep going on.

1520

I have a grandson who put a sign up to cut grass in the summertime, parks and recreation, 16 years old. He went over and they told him that he did not qualify because he did not speak French—to cut grass.

What I am expressing now are my own personal views. To keep Canada together, civil service jobs must be allocated by the percentage of the nationality in that province or this land. They cannot be the exclusive property of one group.

It does not take an Einstein to figure out there are 10 people working in our library in Chelmsford. At the counter, there should be a sign, "En français ici"; on the other side, "Service in English." But no, they all have to be French. By the way, I should tell you Chelmsford was founded by the English: Rayside, Balfour, Dowling, all English names. Like the passenger pigeon, it looks as if we are going to disappear from there.

Being 70 years old and involved in politics all of my life, I have some views on what is going to happen. Here is what I want to happen. I know Quebec is going to separate, but I want a committee formed of English people to find out exactly what it is going to separate with. I do not want them to leave with one square inch of property more than when they came into Confederation.

I was a game warden in the far north and I am aware of vast tracts of land—well, take James Bay I. James Bay I floods vast tracts of the homelands of the Inuit and the Indians. I do not know what you know about Indians and Eskimos, but in their own environment, they are majestic people. I will give you an example.

This great white man started out with a dog team which he had seized from an Indian and had not enough brains to guard against snow blindness. I found out I was going to go snow blind. I knew the minute I did those dogs—they were huskies, part wolf—would eat me, so I shot them. I made myself a snow hut and I climbed inside. I was warm in there, I had my eiderdown. The most beautiful sound I have ever heard in my life is the sound of dogs coming with the Eskimos looking for me. I do not think the white people would do that, but I am not anti-white, that is for sure.

But what is happening up there? If you are observant at all in southern Ontario, you will see that the Arctic owls are coming down, something we never saw before. And why? Because there are no more lemmings up there, where James Bay I is. There are no more Arctic foxes. The geese, when they fly north now, have to shift, because where they nested is under water now.

James Bay II is going to flood the other half of that Arctic land, and nobody opens their mouth. What is it for? I do not know if you know it or not, but James Bay I is to sell power to the Yanks. I do not give a damn about the Yanks. That is my heritage up there and yours, whether you know it or not, and James Bay II is going to double that land. It does not belong to you and me; it belongs to the Inuit and it belongs to the Eskimos. But no, because the great French say, "We want it," nobody dares say no. Well, somebody has to say no, because it is just not going to work.

Getting back to Quebec: When they separate, I do not want them to take one square inch of land more, and I do not think any other of the nine provinces and the two territories do. They will go out with what they came in with, but it has to be on the table for you people here to look at and for me to look at and for them to look at. Then if they want to separate, good. All the land south of the river, if you will check, was settled by the English, and that stays with us.

Put it on the table and call their hand. If they want to go, you are looking at the most happy man in the world, because I know it is never going to work any other way.

Myself, I moved into Chelmsford in the 1940s, speaking the language a bit. I could not have had a better neighbour. There was not a bigoted bone in their body at that point in time. You, sitting around the table who are judging me, you know who pushes bilingualism and French in this province. If you do not know, you should not be sitting here.

All of a sudden, it changed. And it is a shame.

I lived there for 40 years. I walk down the street now, and my grandsons and my sons. I am moving to Sudbury. At 70, I am too old for that kind of crap. I am going to move in here. After 40 years, when you walk into the post office and a hush comes on the group around the table and they do not talk, you know where the hush comes from.

It is up to you. Let me point the finger right at you. It is up to you to make damned sure that when the cards are on the table, the land mass that is Canada that belongs to the non-French is right to the inch.

I do not have a great deal more to say, except that there is a young lady who went to school and became a social worker. Her name is Joyce Danis. She graduated in 1986 and since that time she has had but two jobs. The reason she cannot get any more is that you must be proficient in English and French. Incidentally, that is why the workforce in Chelmsford is at 63 to 4 now. They posted the jobs for years and years: "Must be proficient speaking and reading French." That is the way it changed and nobody said nothing. She has kept a logbook. I would like you to pass it around and see what she is talking about. She has done a real good job.

1530

The Chair: Mr Stewart, if you can sum up, please, because we are getting to the end of the time.

Mr Stewart: What I am saying here I have said in other places. I charged the mayor and councillors with racism, because that is what it is. I had to deal with the most Mickey Mouse outfit you ever saw in the municipal building here. A man was fired because he was English. He was the roads superintendent, a civil engineer. I wrote it all out and I gave it to them up there. This Campbell man, his answer came back—a person who was vice-president of 17,000 miners: "Mr Stewart believes that Dave Crook"—I will name him—"got the job of civil engineer"—

The Chair: It is really not appropriate for us to get into those kinds of individual situations.

Mr Stewart: Well, thanks for your time.

Mr Bisson: There is a question, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: No, we are going to move on.

LÉO THERRIEN

The Chair: Is Léo Therrien here? Go ahead.

M. Therrien : Je remercie la commission pour me donner la chance de parler aujourd'hui ici. Mon nom c'est Léo Therrien.

Je suis originaire de Opasatika, petit village dans le nord de l'Ontario autour de Kapuskasing. J'ai fait mon secondaire à l'école Cité des Jeunes et à Kapuskasing aussi. J'ai fait mon université à Ottawa et l'Université Laurentienne ici à Sudbury, donc dans deux institutions bilingues. J'ai aussi gradué à l'École des services sociaux à Laurentienne et je travaille maintenant depuis six ans dans le développement international ; j'ai travaillé pour un organisme en tant qu'animateur dans le nord de l'Ontario et maintenant je travaille pour un centre d'éducation globale bilingue ici à Sudbury, dans le but de sensibiliser les gens aux problèmes du Tiers monde, ce qui fait que pendant six ans c'est le domaine où j'ai travaillé, dans le développement international. Je vois la situation au Canada plus d'une vision globale, c'est-à-dire une vision qui touche plutôt toute la planète. Aussi, je parle ici en tant que Franco-Ontarien et non au nom d'organisme.

Je pense que, pour comprendre la situation ici au Canada, il faut retourner aux racines du problème, soit aux antécédents au début du pays. Il y a des principes de base qu'il faut d'abord accepter que j'accepte moi aussi, d'abord que les premiers habitants du Canada sont des autochtones. Il faut détruire ce mythe des deux peuples fondateurs des francophones et des anglophones. Ils n'ont rien découvert. Il y avait déjà des populations autochtones ici au Canada auparavant. Donc, s'il y a des revendications qui doivent être écoutées ce sont celles des autochtones.

En 1867 la Confédération a été créée, acceptant la co-existence des deux peuples francophones et anglophones ainsi que l'existence des peuples autochtones. Ce Canada qu'on a connu pendant plusieurs années jusqu'au temps que l'immigration est venue changer la phase du pays, au vingtième siècle où il a y eu une forte immigration des pays d'Europe, ces dernières vingt années cette immigration l'a beaucoup changé. Elle provient surtout aujourd'hui

des pays d'Amérique latine, des pays d'Asie du Sud-Est et des pays d'Afrique, alors que ces gens portent une nouvelle coutume, une nouvelle culture et une nouvelle religion et aussi un nouveau langage à ce multiculturalisme qu'on connaissait au Canada. La différence aussi est que ces gens-là ne sont pas blancs d'Europe mais de différentes couleurs, de différents pays du monde. Alors il y a un certain backlash qui commence à se faire sentir sur les populations, sur les immigrants qui viennent au Canada et sur les réfugiés parce qu'on a une certaine peur de ce qui est différent.

Le Canada qu'on disait tolérant, ouvert et humanitaire envers les peuples du Tiers monde ou envers les gens intéressés à venir au Canada est en train de changer maintenant, et est surtout en train de devenir un Canada intolérant qui est coupé, qui ferme ses portes aux réfugiés et aux immigrants de certains pays, qui tire vers la discrimination. Il y a même un genre d'émergence de racisme qui semble ressortir à travers le pays, qui se fait sentir surtout par des immigrants, mais qui se fait sentir aussi par les populations francophones au Canada comme ici à Sudbury et en Ontario. Elle se fait surtout sentir en Ontario depuis la création de la Loi sur les services en français. Il y a eu un backlash qui est venu attaquer les populations francophones, surtout depuis cette loi-là, mais le backlash existait déjà auparavant.

Depuis la Loi 17 en Ontario au début du siècle où on avait interdit l'enseignement du français en Ontario, il y a toujours eu une montée contre le bilinguisme en Ontario et contre le fait français en Ontario. Il est alors interdit pour les francophones d'apprendre à lire et à écrire dans leur propre langue en Ontario. Alors il est interdit d'apprendre sa propre culture et de connaître sa propre langue et sa propre histoire. En empêchant les gens d'apprendre leur propre langue, on garde les gens dans l'ignorance. On ne connaît pas notre propre culture, on ne comprend même pas notre propre langue.

Le meilleur moyen de contrôler les gens, c'est de les garder ignorants, les empêcher de connaître les antécédents etc. Si tu ne sais pas lire et écrire, tu ne peux pas t'organiser. Je compare ça avec les situations des peuples au Tiers monde ou dans beaucoup de pays de l'Amérique latine ou d'Afrique ou de l'Asie où les populations commencent à s'organiser. Au début, de quoi est-ce qu'ils ont besoin ? Ce sont des cours d'alphabetisation, des cours d'éducation populaire où ils commencent à apprendre à lire et à écrire. Une fois que ces populations-là ont leurs outils de base, elles s'organisent et font des revendications, demandent de meilleures conditions de salaires, de meilleures conditions de vie, des réformes agraires etc. Et c'est lorsque ces populations commencent à s'organiser qu'il y a une répression de la part du gouvernement ou de l'armée par la suite. Plus qu'on demande de droits, plus la répression existe, plus la répression va être forte sur les minorités.

La même chose se passe ici en Ontario. Avant les années 70, il n'existait d'écoles secondaires ici en Ontario, il n'y avait pas d'écoles secondaires à Kapuskasing, l'école se formant en 1969 et 1970. Les écoles comme Penetanguishene et comme Windsor n'existaient pas. Ça veut dire

que les parents des enfants qui ont été à l'école avant 1970 n'ont jamais eu d'école secondaire. Alors, comment montrer aux enfants à apprendre le français si nous ne l'avons pas appris nous-mêmes? Qu'est-ce que les gens font? Maintenant ils ont commencé à se regrouper dans différents organismes et à faire d'autres revendications. Maintenant, les revendications des francophones c'est un collège francophone, l'université francophone, c'est leur offrir des services dans leur propre langue où ils pourront vivre dans leur propre langue et contrôler leur propre destinée, mais ceci n'a jamais existé auparavant.

Si on n'avait pas d'écoles secondaires, ça veut dire que nous aussi on n'a pas eu d'université française. La raison pour laquelle on n'a pas d'université française, c'est qu'il n'y a personne qui est gradué de l'école secondaire, donc il n'y a personne qui a un niveau d'université. Il n'y a pas beaucoup d'avocats francophones, il n'y a pas beaucoup de docteurs francophones, il n'y a pas beaucoup de députés francophones non plus. Pourquoi? Parce que le système n'était pas là, il n'y avait pas les services essentiels pour les francophones de pouvoir survivre. Pour que les gens demandent les services, il faut aussi offrir ces services-là.

À Kapuskasing on a voulu créer l'école française. Le problème est, pourquoi l'école française? Les gens vont déjà à l'école anglaise, ils n'en ont pas besoin, ils parlent déjà l'anglais. Mais le point est que aussitôt qu'on ait créé l'école française, il y a eu plus d'étudiants qui sont inscrits à l'école française aujourd'hui qu'à l'école anglaise parce que la majorité de la population est francophone. La même chose s'est passé avec la Cité collégiale à Ottawa. Pour commencer la Cité collégiale, on disait qu'il y aurait peut-être 1500 étudiants, mais ce sont aujourd'hui autour de 2000 étudiants. Puis encore le total va augmenter. Il s'agit d'offrir les services pour que les gens les demandent, puis ils ne demanderont pas si les services ne sont pas là. Si les écoles ne sont pas là, c'est sûr que les gens ne s'en serviront pas. Il s'agit de mettre les services là et les gens vont s'en servir.

Ce dont les francophones ont besoin, ce sont des outils de base, ce sont des outils pour pouvoir créer leur futur, pour pouvoir ainsi prendre leur place dans la société et prendre leur futur en main. Je pense que ce dont on a besoin en Ontario, surtout l'Ontario français, c'est le besoin de sortir notre révolution tranquille. Le Québec dans les années 60 a passé par la révolution tranquille et est sorti du contrôle qui était surtout émis par l'église et par l'État. Maintenant ils sont chefs d'entreprises, ils sont chefs d'industries, ils possèdent leur propre commerce puis leurs propres institutions financières aussi. Ils sont prêts à se lancer vers le futur. Ils ont déjà une base, ce que les francophones ici en Ontario n'ont pas. Si on veut comparer le Canada avec le Québec, il faut commencer par les mêmes points de base.

La situation francophone, il faut la comparer avec la situation de la minorité anglophone au Québec. Il n'y a pas de comparaison du tout. Au Québec on parle de trois universités anglophones, on parle des cégeps francophones, on parle d'hôpitaux anglophones, on parle des médias complètement anglophones, onze stations de radio, trois de

télévision, trois journaux, trois quotidiens, 18 hebdomadaires, donc une minorité qui est dominante au Québec alors qu'en Ontario on parle de deux universités soi-disant bilingue, à Ottawa et à Sudbury, on parle encore d'une école à Hearst, une école secondaire à Hearst. La population est à 95%, mais l'école doit être bilingue. Pourquoi l'école ne devrait-elle pas être francophone? On parle d'une station de télévision en français en Ontario, la CBLFT, qui a disparu des ondes maintenant — encore des coupures budgétaires. Oui, on supporte les minorités à travers le pays, mais on coupe ce dont on a besoin pour survivre.

1540

Pour pouvoir comprendre la situation du pays, il faut que les revendications du Québec qu'ont les Anglo-Québécois soient données aussi aux Canadiens français en Ontario. Donc, il faut faire des gestes de rapprochement entre le Canada et le Québec. Si on demande au Québec de devenir d'une telle manière, il faut s'assurer que le restant du Canada l'est aussi et le restant du Canada ne l'est pas. Les services ne sont tout simplement pas là à travers du Canada et encore moins en Ontario. Il faut donc que l'Ontario continue à défendre la Loi sur les services en français et ce dans les régions où le besoin est déterminé, donc dans les régions comme à Kapuskasing dont la population est à 60% francophone, à Timmins, 50% francophone. À Sudbury on dit qu'un tiers de la population est francophone, à Hearst, 95%, ce qui fait qu'il y a une population francophone qui demande à être desservie en français. Il faut offrir ces services-là. Ça veut dire qu'il va falloir avoir un personnel qui est bilingue pour pouvoir offrir les services dans leur propre langue. Si on a un problème de santé mentale puis on va aller voir un psychiatre ou un docteur pour parler de son problème puis la personne ne comprend pas notre langue, on ne sera pas prêt à parler.

M. le Président : Monsieur Therrien, si vous voulez conclure, on va terminer.

M. Therrien : Très bien. Mais qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire? Ça veut dire qu'on a besoin d'un rattrapage, il y a un vide à combler pour ce qui est des francophones, pour remplir les postes des employés francophones. Et la personne doit être bilingue. Ça ne veut pas dire qu'elle doit être d'une culture francophone, ça veut dire qu'elle doit parler français. Ce n'est pas tout à fait la même chose. L'important c'est de respecter que les francophones ont le droit à leur futur en Ontario aussi. Si on veut coexister avec le Québec il faut reconnaître les minorités en Ontario aussi.

M. le Président : Bon, merci. Je voudrais appeler Jean Dennie, s'il est ici. Non?

ELLIOT LAKE AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: Lloyd Bussineau, from the district labour council of Elliot Lake.

Mr Bussineau: My name is Lloyd Bussineau. I am president of the Elliot Lake and District Labour Council. With me today is John Simone, chairperson of the legislative committee of the Elliot Lake and District Labour

Council, and David Mellor, vice-chair of the legislative committee, Elliot Lake and District Labour Council.

I want to apologize for our brief. We did not have much time to work on it. We worked all weekend. I got a copy of the draft on Thursday afternoon which you wanted, so we have done the best we could in the short time we had.

The Chair: That is fine.

Mr Bussineau: I will go right into the introduction: Quality of Life and Economic Justice Labour's Vision.

Labour's success over the years has been rooted in two basic strengths. First, we are guided by a vision of social and economic justice, not just for Ontarians but for all Canadians. The Elliot Lake and District Labour Council firmly believes in fairness and equality for all people and their families. Second, we are quick to respond to the changing needs of our affiliates, their members and all working people.

After a decade of political and economic setbacks, as we enter this last decade of the 20th century we seek to reaffirm our vision of a just and equal society for all. This is particularly important with the profound changes occurring in eastern Europe and the USSR. The easing of international hostilities may eliminate the threat of nuclear annihilation. The thaw in superpower relations has a potential to liberate enormous economic resources that can, and must, be put to more productive use.

At this moment, dramatic and tragic events are occurring in the Persian Gulf. Working people there and throughout the world will be affected by the developments in this conflict. No one can predict the outcome, but our hopes and prayers are for a peaceful and equitable settlement of this frightening confrontation. All our dreams are for a world that finds the means to resolve dispute without war.

Labour's vision: Labour's vision for a strong and unified Canada greatly reflects the vision of most Canadians as a whole. Our vision can best be identified in the six following concerns:

1. The opportunity for all members of society to lead productive lives: a full-employment economy with decent jobs for all who want to work; new jobs created through the rebuilding of Canada's infrastructure; and development of effective training and retraining programs for both the employed and unemployed.

2. Full-time, good-paying jobs that offer workers a quality standard of living: a reverse in the decline of workers' real wages; access to higher education and skills training; adequate and affordable housing; extension of full benefit coverage to all workers; and industrial democracy in the workplace.

3. Equitable economic opportunity for all: equal access to full-time and good-paying jobs for all members of society; an end to employment barriers and discrimination based on race, gender or disability; and quality education for all children and millions of illiterate adults.

4. Universal access to quality health care: easy access to affordable insurance coverage; and comprehensive programs covering all medical needs.

5. Equitable economic growth: equal distribution of our enormous productive capacity among regions and groups within these regions.

6. Elimination of poverty: the right of every citizen to share in the wealth of our country.

Clearly, this vision is still only a dream—a dream shared and pursued by generations. It is a dream we can make real if we look past the obstacles and work through the barriers towards our common goals.

We have a long road to travel as northerners. Our present economic and social situation is not encouraging. There is a real need for the federal government to work together as equal partners with the provincial governments and communities in realizing collective change for the betterment of all citizens.

1. What are the values we share as Canadians? For the most part, Canadian values are more closely defined as rights. Canadians believe strongly in the basic rights that are guaranteed by the Charter of Rights and Freedoms: a right to free speech, religion and assembly, to name a few.

From labour's perspective, we desire the need to include additional values to the Charter of Rights. We want the right to a job, the right to join a union, the right to organize, the right to a secure work environment, the right to free collective bargaining on all matters affecting wages, security and working conditions, and the right to political expression and support.

In northern Ontario, our harsh environment and single-resource-based communities strongly defend the values for a full employment economy with the basic rights to workplace democracy.

2. How can we secure our future in the international economy? The free trade agreement was a mistake, and as time elapses this will, in our opinion, become more apparent. Already, thousands of jobs here in Ontario have been lost. High interest rates and the inflated Canadian dollar, although denied by the present federal government, appear to be tied to the free trade agreement. Also, one must include the introduction of the goods and services tax as another deterrent in the inequities experienced within various regions among the provinces.

The first order of business, in our opinion, would be to rescind the three crowning glories of the federal government's restructuring policies: free trade, deregulation and privatization.

Second, Canadians must be participants in formalizing regional and national industrial policies whereby labour, industry, government and the consumer become partners in the development and growth of their own economies.

1550

We must immediately cease discussions with the United States and Mexico in relation to further free trade agreements. It is totally unacceptable that Canadians should be expected to accept a lower standard of living in order to be able to compete with the lesser employment and market conditions which currently exist to some degree in the United States, but more drastically in Mexico.

In the years ahead it is very important that the Canadian trade union movement be involved in developing agreements with trade unions in other countries on the

norms that should govern the conduct of capital and trade on an international basis. Particular attention must be paid to developing a set of international trading arrangements that will prevent countries from enhancing their balance of trade by reducing labour, social and environmental standards.

3. What roles should the federal and provincial governments play? It is clear that in the beginning our government was divided into two authorities, those of federal and provincial, because of our vast geographical settings that gave way to creating physical barriers, isolating groups of Canadians from each other and facilitating communications and transportation problems to an already growing list of concerns.

The role of government became more complex when provincial capitals required a greater degree of structural and economic independence. However, the federal government was unwilling to work towards establishing national policies that addressed provincial concerns.

The federal government's new role must be towards a willingness to become an equal partner in developing regional and national policies that reflect the restructuring of government incentive programs and capital investment mechanisms, to name just a few.

I am just going to break from this for a minute. I want to say my own feelings. We are not now and never have been a vassal of the United States. We are Canadians with our own country and our own history, and we should not be a part of the great American empire, and this province should let Ottawa know that right away.

4. How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? In order to achieve justice for aboriginal people, we must first understand their issues. To achieve this, the federal and provincial governments must allow for a forum for aboriginals to air openly their concerns and grievances. As Canadians, we must be aware of the disputes aboriginals face over land claims, education, language, the right to self-government and their desire to be their own nation and not known as "Canada's aboriginals." Perhaps they need to have the opportunity to raise their children in an atmosphere that would ensure that none of their heritage be lost.

5. What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada? Of the subjects incorporated in the questionnaire, it is clear that one of the major issues tearing this country apart is the role of Quebec within a united Canada and the issue of bilingualism.

We firmly believe it would be a detriment of the province of Quebec and its citizens to separate from the rest of Canada. However, having said that, we believe Quebec must also realize that all its citizens must have the opportunity to language rights. Further, this should be reflected in legislation that enshrines and ensures the language rights of the minority in that province and, indeed, throughout Canada.

In Elliot Lake and along the North Shore, the French-speaking population is approximately 40%, and maybe a lesson can be learned from this northern Ontario region. The French-speaking population maintains its own culture, has its own schools and ongoing social activities, yet at the same time enjoys equal opportunities in all aspects of rural

community life as proud Canadians, along with the majority of the English-speaking population in our area.

6. What is Quebec's future in Canada? Quebec's future in Canada is the same as every other province. We must all work together to protect the many cultures of our country. While it is true that Quebec has a distinct society, we must acknowledge that minorities and aboriginal peoples have the right to protect their own culture. Therefore, Quebec's future in Canada must be as a participating member of the Canadian government. In addition, they must and can be a vital part of Canada's economic, industrial and manufacturing link, prepared to share its natural and human resources and skills to the betterment of a strong, united Canada.

7. What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region? To grow as Canadians we must recognize that what is good for one region may not necessarily be good for another. To find a resolution to this, we must have a mechanism to pursue and discuss openly our concerns and find solutions to the problems. Equal representations and rights must be available for all Canadians.

Of course, a good working relationship between the provinces, territories and the federal government is also important. We must be able to work with all levels of government to help them solve their problems if we want help in solving ours. Canadians from all parts of the country working together would be better equipped to help solve problems, such as with the economy, health care, taxation and language, to name just a few.

The government of Canada and the provinces must be willing to employ a full range of policy tools in order that regional imbalances can be corrected to ensure Canada's economic development. Economic balance would ensure that Canada's ability to compete in the world market would be strengthened. This in turn would create a stronger Canadian economy while protecting our different cultures. In so doing, we can be assured that we are a part of a strong family, with everybody contributing collectively to Canada's wellbeing.

The federal government must divert funds to rebuild and double-track our railroads from coast to coast, in order to facilitate the movements of people and commodities between provinces and other countries.

I want to break from the brief for a second. I want to say that 46 years ago we had a very good rail system in this country. We had our own ships plying the high seas. Our universities were turning out scientists and technicians by the hundreds every year. Our aircraft companies were at least 20 years ahead of everybody else. And we were one country—maybe speaking two languages, but we were all Canadians. What I am going to say now is that what we had before we can have again. Those are my feelings.

8. What does Ontario want? The people of Ontario have the same dreams and expectations as all Canadians. Ontarians desire the right to live a long, productive, dignified life as Canadians. We must understand that while our expectations are basically the same, we are different culturally. Therefore, it is necessary to accept and grow with these contrasts. This best can be reinforced through a Constitution that is both equitable and irrefutable. Our needs

are no different than any other Canadian. We must pull together if we are to overcome the dilemmas that as Canadians we all face.

The present government of Ontario has had, as part of its platform since 1984, the following people's charter, which would serve well for all Canadians and we hope some day will become a reality. I am going to read the people's charter right now.

"Our economy exists to produce wealth for all. Only a democratic government which intervenes in a meaningful way can improve the lives of people collectively so each may live the good life individually.

"Good health care, pensions, education, housing and recreation are the right of all. The wealth created is subject to fair distribution.

"A planned economy and a secure future require recognition of the right of all to jobs. The rights of working people to control all aspects of their work must be affirmed and management's rights progressively reduced.

"Peace, a clean environment and democratic decision-making in a world of full equality for all are essential. The right of all people to participate fully, without discrimination, in their communities must be guaranteed.

"New Democrats work to replace authoritarian structures with democracy; poverty and misery with security and happiness; and the fears of the present with hope for the future."

It was adopted 30 June 1984.

I am going to conclude. For the most part, all Canadians share in labour's vision that provides the opportunity for all members of society to lead productive lives. Therefore, the federal government, in conjunction with the provinces and territories, must ensure that the Constitution allows all Canadians to play a key role in developing the social, economic and technical infrastructures necessary for industrial planning, economic justice and quality of life for all our people.

1600

Mr Bisson: Where do I begin? There are many questions. I think I will just touch on one issue, because we can get into a long discussion here. One of the things you mentioned in the brief—I think it is something that we all, as Canadians, can share—is that one of the things we want as people is the opportunity to share in the wealth of the province and the wealth of the country. You talk about the need to have a fairer distribution of wealth with regard to people having access to jobs, full employment, good wages, good benefits, etc.

The problem, as most people see it, in getting those rights or those benefits from our employers or from society in general is that there is a perception out there on the part of some of the business leaders that "I have to give up something." I think to a certain extent it is the same argument when we talk about equity, whether with regard to pay or access to work or language or whatever.

What wisdom can you give our committee and all members of the House? We are all interested basically in the same things and making sure that all Ontarians and all Canadians have access to work, are able to fully enjoy the

benefits our province and our country can give, without giving the impression to some of the business leaders or other people in our society who would see that as an infringement on their own territory. How do you deal with that? There is a perception that if you as a worker are going to negotiate wages with your employer and you get an extra 50 cents an hour, it is going to cost him or her more money. So what do you do? That is really the thing. We are talking about power structures. Tough question.

Mr Bussineau: I will let Dave Mellor answer that question.

Mr Mellor: I am from Elliot Lake; I have been a resident of Elliot Lake for the last 26 years. We all have our differences and we all have differences of opinion in political and economic areas, but let me tell you, when the chips are down, it is surprising how easily we can work together as ordinary people, whether we be from the managerial side or from the labour side. The experience in Elliot Lake, for example, over the last two years—I do not have to tell you politicians the dilemma Elliot Lake faces at present. With the blessing of our members, of course—it is a strong union town—we realized that the economic climate for employers in Elliot Lake was not very good. We got together and did the right thing. Our members indirectly took some—not concessions, but were very lenient in their demands over the past contracts. In fact, we did extend our contracts. Sometimes it takes hard times to bring you to reality, but I think when those hard times arrive, people will work together for the betterment not only of themselves but of their community, of their fellow people. I think the Elliot Lake situation over the years has proven that.

No one was more anti-company than me, I can assure you. I have been involved in the labour movement all my life—well, ever since joining the workforce—and even my attitude, when I was really put to the test and facing reality on an economic and social point of view, was mellowed to some degree. But I did that because I knew the other side was prepared to do the same. I think that is what it takes. I think it takes hard times to bring people to realize that, yes, sometimes it is better to work together in harmony than to have confrontation. Given the present economic situation in this province, I think you will see that over the years to come there will be a tendency for more co-operation and more understanding of each other's roles, so that in the long run it will be for the betterment of all the citizens of this province. I think our experience in Elliot Lake has proven that.

Mr Offer: My question somewhat takes off from the response to the last question. You spoke about the ability to work together, and on page 5 of your brief you talk about the roles the federal and provincial governments should play. In that respect, you talk about the structuring of government incentive programs and capital investment mechanisms as well as some other matters.

My question is, you say that there has to be a new role for the federal government and that this new role must be towards being an equal partner. I am wondering if you can expand a little bit on that paragraph. I say that because we

have had a number of submissions in not only this area but other areas that talk about the responsibilities of both the provincial and federal governments and how in some people's opinion they should not be changed; in others, they should be changed.

I am wondering, on the basis of your submission from the district labour council, do you see that there is the necessity for a reallocation of powers between the provincial and federal governments, and if so, is that reallocation towards more powers for the federal government or more powers for the provincial government or something in between? I am wondering if you might be able to share with us some thoughts on that.

Mr Simone: At first, it is a very difficult question to answer, but I think we have to get back to the grass roots. The first order of business is establishing community identity. Generally what happens is that industry has an interest in a particular area, whether it be for mineral exploitation, forestry, etc. What happens is that communities become born and there is insufficient infrastructure that is set in place unless 20 or 30 years has progressed down the line.

What we are proposing here is that the fly-in type of operations have to be totally withdrawn; that is, there has to be long-term planning for these communities. If an industry wants to go in and exploit resources over a 30-year period, then there has to be a mechanism in place that also provides for community planning throughout that period.

We are saying the federal government has to take a lead role, if not anything else, to guide those incentive programs. Federal jurisdictions, provincial jurisdictions: All too often we hear in our area, "Well, the province is doing everything it can, but the federal government hasn't done anything yet." We are saying that if a community is allowed to survive for 30 years and if companies put in their five-year plans or 10-year plans, then it should be done in an equal partnership between all parties, communities, workers, the consumer, federal and provincial governments, so we are saying a long-term plan for all industry development within communities and cities for every region in Canada.

The Chair: We are going to proceed. We are at the end of the time. Thanks for your presentation and questions.

JEAN DENNIE

The Chair: Can I call next Jean Dennie.

M. Dennie : Merci, Monsieur le Président, bonjour membres du comité. Je vais vous donner ma vision d'une nouvelle constitution ainsi qu'un nouveau Canada pour les années 2000. Comme nous le savons, le Canada a été fondé et développé par trois groupes principaux, les Français, les Anglais et les autochtones. Aujourd'hui nous avons une variété de groupes ethniques qui aident au développement du Canada. Notre pays s'est transformé d'une société simple et rurale en une société moderne, technologique et urbaine. Il y a seulement un élément qui n'a pas complètement suivi la modernisation de notre société comme nous la connaissons aujourd'hui : la constitution.

Je suis devant vous aujourd'hui non pas pour discuter du passé, mais pour vous donner ma vision d'un Canada fort et uni. Le Canada est un pays qui se distingue des

États-Unis; nous sommes un pays qui est tolérant. Nous avons une population qui a un respect pour les droits et libertés de nos frères et sœurs, ce qui est représenté par la Charte des droits et libertés. Nous avons une société dont la politique n'est pas une d'assimilation, «melting pot», mais d'intégration, avec le droit de garder et même d'épanouir sa propre langue et sa propre culture. Le Canada a un système de santé qui ne crée aucune discrimination; tous les citoyens et les citoyennes ont le droit de recevoir des soins de santé de la même qualité que ceux de leur voisin. Le Canada est ou était doté de plusieurs institutions, telles que Radio-Canada, Via-Rail, Air Canada et Pétro-Canada.

Une autre institution qui nous distingue des pays de l'Ouest est notre système parlementaire. Nous avons un système fédéral composé de la Chambre des communes, du sénat et du gouverneur général. Mais la question qui peut être soulevée est la suivante : est-ce que ce système fédéraliste fonctionne comme auparavant ? Personnellement, je crois que non. Il nous faut une réforme incroyable au niveau parlementaire.

1610

Premièrement, il faut éliminer le sénat. Comme nous le savons tous, cette chambre est utilisée pour de la politique partisane, un système de récompense pour des amis. Pour remplacer cette institution, nous pouvons agrandir la Chambre des communes pour y inclure des députés qui représenteront des circonscriptions ainsi que des régions spécifiques, telles que le nord de l'Ontario.

Pour compléter notre réforme du Parlement, nous devons abolir le poste de gouverneur général. Cette institution est très puissante, mais encore, le parti élu l'utilise pour de la partisanerie. Si le gouverneur général n'utilise pas son pouvoir, tel que refuser de donner la sanction royale à des projets de loi ou de dissoudre la Chambre des communes, surtout lorsque nous avons un gouvernement très impopulaire, il faut sérieusement considérer l'abolition de ce poste. Avec les réformes mentionnées ci-haut, la Chambre des communes deviendra le seul outil décisionnel.

Discutons maintenant de l'économie, non mondiale mais nationale, plus spécifiquement l'entente de libre-échange entre le Canada et les États-Unis. Je dois avouer que je ne suis pas économiste, mais j'ai acquis une compréhension de l'économie et cette entente est désastreuse pour le Canada.

Cette entente va non seulement augmenter l'influence américaine au Canada, mais nous allons souffrir excessivement au point de vue de perte d'emplois. Et maintenant le gouvernement fédéral a décidé de se joindre aux discussions pour un libre-échange avec les États-Unis et le Mexique. Imaginez le nombre de compagnies qui vont se rendre au Mexique. Cet exode ne sera pas causé car les chefs de ces compagnies veulent profiter du climat tropical; nous savons bien pourquoi : une main d'œuvre qui est extrêmement moins coûteuse que celle du Canada. Au lieu de signer une entente de libre-échange avec les États-Unis et le Mexique, je crois fortement qu'il faudrait d'abord éliminer les barrières économiques interprovinciales.

Discutons maintenant du rôle des autochtones au Canada. Depuis l'arrivée de l'homme blanc les autochtones de notre pays ont souvent été oubliés. Nous leur avons enlevé

leurs territoires et plusieurs autochtones ont souffert l'assimilation de l'homme blanc. C'est pour cette raison qu'il faut travailler dans le but de réinstaurer la culture, la langue et la valeur des autochtones. Pour accomplir ceci, la première nation doit avoir un contrôle absolu sur l'éducation de leurs enfants et des adultes, sur la justice, à l'exception des lois fédérales, sur les programmes de services sociaux et le maintien de leurs propres territoires. Donc, ceci veut dire que l'homme blanc ne doit pas avoir la décision finale dans ces secteurs. L'aspect le plus important que nous devons sérieusement considérer est de réserver un siège à la table constitutionnelle pour les autochtones. Cette place doit être créée immédiatement et non dans le futur.

Quel fut le rôle du bilinguisme au Canada? Le bilinguisme est très important, non pour offrir des services en français à l'extérieur du Québec, mais aussi des services en anglais au Québec.

L'offre de services aux francophones au niveau fédéral et provincial n'est pas suffisant. Pour combattre l'assimilation des francophones au Canada, les gouvernements provinciaux doivent donner aux francophones un pouvoir absolu dans le domaine de l'éducation. Nous devons contrôler nos propres conseils scolaires. Pour assurer que le taux d'assimilation reste très bas, les provinces du Canada doivent ainsi garantir aux francophones la création de collèges et universités en français.

J'aimerais prendre ce temps pour demander aux membres néo-démocrates de ce comité d'exercer des pressions auprès de leurs collègues au caucus d'accepter et de mettre en oeuvre les recommandations du Rapport de la Commission consultative sur les services collégiaux en français dans le nord de l'Ontario.

Pour terminer, je vais partager avec vous ma vision d'un Canada fort, uni, mais décentralisé. Le rapport Allaire du Parti libéral du Québec est un outil de discussion. J'appuie ce rapport non seulement parce que je crois que le Québec a une place au sein du Canada, mais aussi parce que ce rapport exprime la réalité vers un nouveau Canada.

Dans les dernières décennies, les provinces ont acquis de plus en plus de pouvoir. Prenons un exemple en particulier, tout récemment, le projet de loi C-69 du gouvernement fédéral. Cette législation diminue l'argent du fédéral aux provinces de l'Ontario, du Québec, de l'Alberta et de la Colombie-Britannique. L'an 2004, ces provinces auront la responsabilité de subventionner leurs propres programmes tels que les services sociaux et l'éducation.

En conclusion, pour garder le Canada ensemble, il faut décentraliser le pays. Un gouvernement central et fort ne fonctionne plus. Il faut faire un transfert énorme de pouvoir du fédéral aux provinces. Mais il faut réaliser que les petites provinces, telles que l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, le Nouveau-Brunswick etc ne pourront peut-être pas subventionner les nouveaux pouvoirs, donc il faudra peut-être faire un réalignement des provinces. Ceci veut dire que les provinces de l'Est formeront une province suivies du Québec et de l'Ontario; ensuite pour l'Ouest, nous aurons une amalgamation du Manitoba, de la Saskatchewan et de

l'Alberta, et la Colombie-Britannique qui restera telle quelle.

Voilà, membres du comité, ma vision d'un nouveau Canada. Je vous remercie pour prendre ce temps de m'avoir écouté.

Ms Churley: I did not actually take notes on what you said at the beginning of your speech, but you said something about the powers of the federal government and I just wanted to ask you what you think about—of course, after the compromise of 1982 where there was not a good discussion around the way we run our country, which I believe is part of the problem; a discussion should have taken place then.

Basically we do not have that much of a different system than we had before 1982. But one of the different things is, of course, the drafting of the Charter of Rights, which means that this results in more of a role, an increased role, for the courts in our system. I am just wondering what you think about that, if you think that is a good thing.

Mr Dennie: I think the courts are there to interpret the laws; they are not there to change the laws. I think that is why we have elected officials. It does not just have to stay on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms; it is on any law. They have the right to interpret the law, but it comes then to the power of Parliament, of the elected officials to then modify the laws according to the judgements of the courts.

Ms Churley: But of course if you have laws that are so loosely defined, and I think that has been part of the problem, then the courts end up having to interpret very often what these different things mean.

CLAYTON SHAWANA

The Chair: I call Clayton Shawana, from the Wikwemikong first nation of Manitoulin Island.

Mr Shawana: Good afternoon Chairman, members of the committee, audience, listeners.

[Remarks in native language]

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to address some of our concerns. That, by the way, is in another official language of Canada.

It is unfortunate we were only given, I think, Thursday afternoon to prepare some sort of a presentation to you. Actually, it should take a couple of days. Even that would be very limiting.

What we have done is we were asked to talk to you on the social and economic development concerns of Indian first nations here in Ontario and as they probably relate in Canada. You will have to understand that there are some givens. An Indian on an Indian reserve is a ward of the federal government, and as such he is not a legal person; he is not a legal entity.

Indians are, by stats, the fastest growing labour force in Canada. We have a lot of unsettled issues. Your version of Canada is 120 years old. I believe ours is quite a bit older than that, and yet we have unsettled land ownership issues in this country, land claims.

1620

On our Indian reserves, we do not all wish to be identified as drains on the public taxpayer's dollar, if you will. We have different levels of people on our reserve also. We have doctors. We have lawyers. We have the ones who are uneducated. We have the old people. Like the rest of Canada, we too have a brain drain. We lose our people to the white communities off reserve. There they prosper. They join society. We on the reserve, or some of us who choose to return, have to try to hold the community together for the less fortunate.

My name is Clayton Shawana. I am a member of the Wikwemikong band on Manitoulin Island. We are probably the third-largest Indian reserve in Canada in land. Our reserve is in two sections. It is about 110,000 acres. There is 126 miles of shoreline on it. Our tribal background is of three. Prior to 1835 there were Odawas. After 1836 the Potawatamies of the plains came in. In 1850 people that were dissatisfied with the Robinson-Huron treaty area up here moved down to the island and into our communities.

I run what is called the Wikwemikong Development Commission. It is a non-profit corporation. I started it up for one reason. I returned from the United States. I lived in the United States up until 1975 and my chief phoned me down there and asked me if I would come home and help him run the reserve. About that time my kids were starting to become seven, eight years old. They were starting to be ashamed of what they were and I thought maybe it was time I took them home so that they will learn who they actually are.

I came home in 1976, ran the arena in Wikwemikong for five years and this job of band economic development officer came along. I applied for it and it became obvious that sitting behind a desk was not the answer. I needed a vehicle, something I could use to create a legal identity for the band. It was with a non-profit corporation, and with that non-profit corporation we have been able to access provincial and federal programs and we average probably a million and a quarter a year. I do a lot of proposal writing. I have girls who work with me on that. We have formed a nucleus in our development corporation where we help band members.

I have a colleague whom I work with very closely along the North Shore, who works with seven smaller bands. Today we will try to give you a picture of development on the reserve from the large context and from the small reserves. I give you Joe.

Mr Corbiere: Good afternoon. My name is Joe Corbiere, and like Clayton said I work with the seven first nations along what is called the North Shore, which stretches between Sudbury here on the east and Sault Ste Marie on the west. Out of those seven communities, they vary in size from some of the smaller ones of maybe 100 people to the larger ones of about 1,200.

I work for what is called Mamaweswen, the North Shore tribal council, and in it we try to deliver services to the communities that are affiliated with us and also, I guess, participate in discussions such as this with whoever asks us.

I think some of the things from the economic development perspective that both Clayton and I get involved with quite a bit are that we like to try to improve the quality of life in our communities. This goes through many different areas, whether it is job creation, helping to explore other employment opportunities off reserve, educational opportunities or just general development in our communities.

I guess part of what we would like to do as native people is to share in the wealth of Canada and become active participants in the economy. A lot of times native people are viewed as drains on the economy, drains on the taxpayer's dollar, yet I believe we want the opportunity to participate just in the Canadian economy. Right now, I would say in the North Shore area, and probably throughout Canada where communities are located, there could be quite a large economic effect in the local area. For example, just to do a rough ballpark calculation, out of those seven communities averaging, there might be a total population of 6,000 to 7,000 people in the areas of Sudbury, Sault Ste Marie, the North Shore, Blind River and what not. They would probably put in somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$70 million into those economies. But a lot of our participation is involved in social transfer payments, education and training. There is a small and growing native economy, job opportunities, business creation.

One thing I would like to emphasize is that our communities want to find solutions to the problems. For generations now, I guess we have been told by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and other government agencies, whether they be provincial or federal: "Here is a solution to your problem. We are going to come and make everything well again." Well, it has helped to some extent, but I would say in the majority it has not. I think you might be fairly aware of some of the statistics—the high unemployment rates, the high suicide rates, the drug and alcohol abuse problems—and I guess what I am asking is that we would be given the opportunity to find our own solutions because the outside solutions have not worked. I believe that, given these opportunities, if we are able to find our solutions, it benefits all of Canada. It definitely benefits our native communities, but it gives us a better basis to participate in the general Canadian society.

A specific area that is being worked on right now is through training and I believe Clayton mentioned earlier about the working-age population. According to some of the statistics in the general Canadian society, the working-age population is decreasing, but in the native communities it is the opposite, where our working-age populations are increasing at a faster rate than the general society.

Through the Department of Employment and Immigration, and in consultation with some of our native organizations at the provincial level and the national level, they have created this program called Pathways to Success. Some of the, I guess, background to that is they have basically had a pilot project for this in the province of British Columbia. However, there are a lot of differences, as there are all across Canada regionally and what not, but some of the communities in BC are quite a bit smaller than what they are here. In Wikwemikong community, for instance, there are 3,000 to 4,000 people, while in BC we

believe the biggest native community might be around 400, and it provides a lot of different opportunities, a lot of different barriers to development.

One of the things that I mentioned before about allowing us to find our own solutions, part of that is the community control in regard to these training dollars through Pathway to Success. Now, that seems to be the theory behind the present setup, which is scheduled to start 1 April, but we really have to, and hopefully through this discussion, ensure the community control. Indian Affairs right now is devolving some of its economic development dollars directly to the communities and to tribal councils to help right at the community level rather than, again, sitting back and saying, "We have the solution."

One of the things that concerns us about this community control is the equal representation. Depending on the size of the particular community, right now we could end up with what are called regional management boards for Pathways to Success where perhaps a community like Wikwemikong, with 4,000 to 5,000 people, would only have one representative, while another community could have 50 people and have the same representative on these regional boards.

The other part I would like to talk about right now is the land claim process. There are a lot of outstanding land claims across Canada. The ones we are more familiar with are the ones in this Robinson-Huron treaty area and it is a really slow process. I am not sure, but I think there might be only one or two that have been settled in the last 10 to 15 years. There is a policy ongoing right now that only five or six of these land claims get negotiated at a time and from the community I am from at Batchawana, there are probably at least three or four separate land claims. I think someone had mentioned that just the land claims that have sort of been tabled with the federal government will take maybe 100 or 200 years just to go through them, not even to settle them.

We really need a process that speeds it up and really tries to settle the land claims. We feel that just by settling some of the land claims and the outstanding issues such as that it allows for, in some instances, money and dollars being delivered to the communities so that they can decide on their own development—but other resources as well, whether it is land that has been repurchased, say, from the province or what not. But this can lead into economic development dollars, which ties back into leading into our approach about economic development and making the decisions at the community level. With that, I will turn it back over to Clayton.

1630

Mr Shawana: I would like to add on to the land claims. It is like a card game; everybody knows you have 52 cards in a deck. But in a land claim there is a developer who lives outside the reserve, there is a developer who lives inside. They do not know what rights, what issues they are going to face in their development. If everybody knew exactly what was what in these land claims, they would settle. Then everybody can go about their business of developing whatever it is they want to develop.

Wikwemikong has two land claims right now. One is called Point Grondine. That is a very straight issue. It was 1850, where English surveyors came in and measured off in miles, and the Indian, whose second language at that time was French, was speaking in leagues. So it is just a basic difference in measurements. A lot of the reserves bounded then were resolved within two years, but this one was never. So it is really a straightforward issue of settling it, but I understand the federal government does not want to get involved in it. The province wants to do it, but the feds do not.

We also have 27 islands around the Wikwemikong reserve. The people did not settle in Wikwemikong by accident. There was a design to it. It was a good hunting area, good berry area—good berries, lots of berries—and there was good fishing, abundant fishing around those waters surrounding Wikwemikong. The province has now closed off two bays, saying that they are—I call it playing with Mother Nature by messing with the splake, the lake trout. They are calling it the splake; I call it the mutant lubetube. It is a greasy fish. But stuff like that—we need our waters back.

Two other items. The way we are doing this, we are going to give you four problems that we see. Joe has outlined two; I will give you two more. One is the GST—and we will try to speed it up after this. I am sorry we are slowing down. But the GST, if you read in the papers the administrative policies, it is a real boon, it is good news for Indian people. I got news: it is not. Look at the way they are implementing the administration of that. A case in point is a postage stamp. On an Indian reserve they say everybody pays postage. That is the way it came down from Graham Armour, director of retail operations for Canada Post. What he neglected to understand was that Wikwemikong has 600 houses in its community. There is a lot of intrareserve mail just in the administration and we are saying that those should not be GST costs, but they never stopped to figure that there were some reserves big enough, with their own post offices.

GST right now is a hot spot. In the development corporation I am in, we are trying to find out just how it is going to affect us. Probably what has been laid down now will be changed in three months or two months, just as soon as they can plug up the loopholes that we may find in them. But it is not the rose garden that many people may figure on an Indian reserve with GST.

The civil service is another problem area that I see. It is a real mind-boggling item when you stop to think that civil servants who are supposed to be working for Indians should be phasing themselves out. Ideally, when the Indian develops himself, they should be stepping back and saying, "Okay, they are big enough; they can go by themselves." But what happens is, when a person gets a job in the civil service, the first thing he shoots for is tenure. So he gets this tenure, and the next thing is retirement. Once he sees those, the closer he is to attaining his goal of retirement—is to keep that Indian subservient under his thumb, undeveloped. That is how his guaranteed pension comes in. Those jobs should be phased out. They should be sunset cloused. They like to use that phrase on us: "Sunset

clause your proposals." I think they should do that with the positions that are dedicated to Indian affairs, either in the provincial or the federal sector.

But it is not all a bitch list we have here. We have some possible solutions that we would like you to look at. I outlined these, and Joe and I just put notes on them.

The first one: The provincial and federal government should play a larger role in assuming greater risks in native business startups by providing tax breaks for joint-venture participants and by giving special consideration for native-owned businesses in some government contracts. This is done in Alberta and in the United States. We could create our own Mexico here. I listened to the last four presentations and they seem to be all bounding on we are losing a lot of jobs to the United States. They are going down into the Bible belt, Arkansas, that whole central area, but in three years' time they will be shoved off into Mexico. But here we have an opportunity. You have the same thing here that Mexico offers except for the climate. You have a high labour force, you have the low overhead, you have the land on the reserves. Give business people a break to join up with Indian bands to start up businesses on Indian reserves. There will be opportunity created not just for the Indian but for all of us.

So what we have done is we have 13 possible solutions—that is the first one—that I would like to see addressed. Give breaks to businesses that want to locate on-reserve and native-owned businesses in some government contracts. In the United States I believe they have a policy in any government contract that 5% of the contract has to be given to a minority corporation, albeit, whatever it may be, they are allowed to bid on it. You register as a minority corporation, you have seven years to tap into these contracts, and after seven years you are no longer eligible and as such you should be able to stand on your own feet. Canada should take a look at that. I would like to turn the next one over to Joe.

Mr Corbiere: Some of the other things that we are suggesting in our solutions, our wish list, is the supporting of establishment of financial institutions on reserves, perhaps credit unions, which can contract with the band development corporations to act as the Province of Ontario Savings Office. We have got to try and ensure that more money turns around to the local communities before it goes out into the towns and cities in Canada and the province.

Another thing we are looking at is developing the capacity in the first nations for community economic development agencies. Like in the case of the tribal council, we are involved with the province for what are called the municipal economic development associations. Although we are not municipalities, the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines helped us to start what is called the enterprise circle on the North Shore. This would help us in economic planning, developing economic development organizations and legal frameworks to handle things such as the GST and incorporation, etc.

One of the other things we have already talked about is the training. We have high illiteracy rates and dropout rates, so we need the training and education and we need it in a way that people on the reserves and other native com-

munities can see the impact and know that it is going to be beneficial rather than something that just does not work. I guess part of that is just having us kept aware of some of the job opportunities.

In a story that Clayton tells me sometimes, it is like, "Tell us when the train is coming, not when it has passed already." That seems to be what happens sometimes. You say, "Well, why didn't you take that opportunity?" Well, a lot of times we do not know about it or we are not kept really informed.

I guess another area on our list is funding for annual native sectorial conferences on the northern economy—for example, tourism, natural resources—just to keep our people aware of what is going on, like in the fur industry, the logging industry, tourism especially in northern Ontario. These annual conferences would definitely help us understand a lot of the issues that the non-native entrepreneurs and governments are dealing with.

I guess one particular area is there has to be some sort of model to sensitize government staff, government politicians, about native concerns and needs. For example, Northern Development and Mines had a group of native people from this area come in and discuss issues. It was an interesting experience, I think, from both sides of the fence because we found out things that people did not know from either side, even though some of the people with that particular branch of the government had been working with natives for, you know, 20 years, 30 years and what not.

1640

I guess one of the things that we see is also encouragement by the educational institutions, whether they are the community colleges and/or the universities and high schools, I guess, to get the native students into the hard sciences. A lot of our students right now are really being pushed into social work streams in colleges and universities and, granted, we do need social workers but we do not need 100 coming out of the local schools, where there might be jobs for only 10 people. It just does not make any sense, but they are sort of being pushed out through that sort of thing. It would really be helpful to us to have some specially trained or fully trained financial people—accountants, investors and what not—and scientists. We are getting involved now in a lot of environmental issues. It would be nice to be able to work with a native person who has this background.

I guess that sums up my part of the presentation, other than I should tell you that, as you probably noticed, I do not look native. My father was a past chief from the Batchawana band. My mother's father was native and her mother was right from England. So some people have told me this allows me a chance to be the spy in some of the government organizations.

The Chair: Mr Shawana, if you could sum up, we have gone beyond the time allocated.

Mr Shawana: It is very unfortunate. May I ask for five minutes?

The Chair: If you could try to do it shorter than that we would appreciate it.

Mr Shawana: Okay, open up the civil service to natives through more aggressive employment equity implementation. Right now that policy is a farce, especially in management positions. The Ministry of Natural Resources will give me all the pine-cone-picking positions I want, but that is not what I am looking for. I am looking for management positions for Indian people. Eliminate barriers to native participation in federal and provincial programs. A farmer on the Manitoulin, if he is based in a municipality, is eligible for \$11,500 in annual subsidies; the native on an Indian reserve who is farming is not. There is no reason why he should not be eligible for those also, just because he on an Indian reserve.

Increased representation on relevant provincial boards and commissions related to economic development, social development, health and natural resources: Alberta did a study on tourism and found that the Indian was the third-biggest attraction in Alberta, next to the mountains and the lakes. Since they could not put mountains and lakes on boards, they put the Indian on there and they are promoting him around the world.

Specific native funding for environmental problems or solutions: I keep reading about something called the green plan, although I have yet to see anything concrete on it. The Ontario Trappers Association sent a letter out this week about trying to get a fur sale going in North Bay. I saw the letter; it was addressed to my son. He had a fishing and trapping licence when he was in high school and so they sent him out the brochure. They said, "One of the biggest mistakes that the Ontario Trappers Association made during the past few years was never associating themselves with the Indian trapper," because Greenpeace has no problems with the Indian trapper. That is something they lost, so now they are regretting that they never did tie in more closely with the native trapper and as a result get Greenpeace off their back.

But you are talking about this green plan. Why do you not unite it with an Indian? I mean he is a natural. He is supposed to be the environmentalist of the whole thing. He is the one who did not put up the factories and the other pollutants. It could be a real marriage of the two.

I am dating myself here, but I was in grade 13 in 1961 and the guidance counsellor asked me what I wanted to be. I did not know. There was no TV. We did not have a TV. I read books, but you never saw anything through books. I told the guidance counsellor I did not know. I was in 13A, supposed to be the brain class, and I did not know what I wanted to be. As a result, that is as far as I ever went in school.

But one thing that happened since, in the meantime, out in Manitoba I saw an Indian group that brought in Indian kids to Winnipeg once a month and it would run workshops. The day I was there, they brought in an insurance company, representatives out of Pueblo, New Mexico, and it was all Indian-owned, Indian-staffed and Indian-operated. That afternoon they brought in a group of corporate lawyers out of New York City who were all Mohawks. It gave those 120 kids who were sitting there the opportunity to dream, to broaden their horizons, rather than it being strongly focused on just their own little com-

munity. I think there should be some way that can be done other than handing out pamphlets in high schools and colleges, getting an active role model association going.

I hope we did not upset anybody by what we said. I like to think we should be equal partners in all this. The other two groups before us have very differing views. I like to think we can associate with all of them. Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you. Even though we are a little bit beyond the time, there were a couple of questions. I would be happy to allow one question. Mr Harnick.

Mr Harnick: We have heard an awful lot in the last week or so about native self-government, about land claims. Your presentation was really the first presentation we heard dealing with economics on the reservations and with the first nations. One of the things I would like you to help us with is the delivery of social programs by the government. When I ask for some help in getting your views about that, I want as well to keep in mind the idea of natives deciding for themselves. How can government help to develop with natives proper delivery of social programs?

Mr Shawana: First of all, I am not an expert on the social programs on the reserve. I am more into economic development and the management of a development corporation. But we do tap into it a bit. I see a lot of problems myself in there and I think Joe mentioned it—I do not know if he did—but one thing that we have always stressed was that in schools there should be more hard sciences taught.

Ten, 15, 20 years ago the Indian was perceived as having a social problem. He was this, he was that, and "Well, fine, let's equip him with social workers." To me, that was not the answer; the answer is jobs, meaningful jobs where an Indian can plan, "Two weeks in June, after the kids get out, the wife and I are going to go down to Acapulco," not saying, "I need 4 more weeks to get 20 weeks in to get my UI benefits for this year." That, to me, is not good social planning, but that is the box in which we are caught. There are a lot of programs in there where—I should not say this in school, I guess—but it is too easy to get things and, as a result, you fall into that.

In the 1950s, Wikwemikong had a lot of self-supporting farms on it. They took care of themselves. I grew up in an Indian school, a residential school, and there were a lot of us. The problem was we were three miles out of the main village and, if my parents wanted to keep me at home, they had to move into the village and abandon their farms, starting the welfare cycle: going into towns, leaving their self-sustaining farms behind just so they could stay with their kids. The reason our farm survived was they sent us away to schools, but it broke up a lot of families.

Social programs, to me, are very powerful. They like to jump on people who are under them in the communities, like I was. Our welfare office is terrified of the auditors out of Sudbury here. They are scared to make decisions. They are allowed to make decisions, but they will not make decisions for fear of upsetting the auditing staff out of the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

1650

I should have mentioned earlier, the Calmeadow loans program that is going across the country, I was the pilot program for that. We did it for two years. It was done with Martin Connell out of Toronto. We had roadblocks when we were trying to set up small loans programs on reserve. Because of this, a lot of people did not want to come out of the closet. If they were involved in arts activity, crafts activity, they did not want to acknowledge it. But in order to sell your art, you should acknowledge it; you should put your name on it.

I asked Martin and some of the people he knew if they could get us an audience with ministers so that we could talk to them about our problems, and fortunately for us, Martin was able to do that. But yes, I think you need the grass-roots people more to design their own needs on social programs rather than it being a federally designed program.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation. You have given us a number of useful specifics to take back with us.

Mr Shawana: I hope you do not use it as the know-it-all because there are a lot of other things involved in this.

Mr Harnick: Do you have a copy of your brief?

The Chair: I think, Mr Shawana, members of the committee would be interested in getting a copy of your brief, if you would like to send it to us.

GILBERT GRAY

The Chair: I will go back to the list and check to see if Lois Miller is here. No. Then two additions to the list: Is Tom Taylor here? Gilbert Gray?

Mr Gray: Hi, ladies and gentlemen. I am here for one reason, from my experience, to try and keep this nation functioning to the best of our ability. I only have the right to one opinion and principles. I also have the right of opinion, or partly the right of opinion, what we all like to know is what the Constitution of Canada represents. To my years in Canada, the Constitution is more of a motherhood issue than it is a federal issue.

When they wrote that Meech Lake accord, the constitutional Meech Lake accord, they never asked any lady to be in on that. There was just a bunch of old stags there who went ahead and drew it all up and promoted trouble upon trouble. I was brought up in Quebec, 1914, and I moved across the pond into Sudbury here. I worked in mining development, then I moved back to Quebec. I bought a farm there in 1961 and stayed there until 1980, when I moved back into Ontario. It was not over language rights.

But the society we are talking about, society is the Bible addition for all people. It represents the whole nation. So Quebec says they are not in society. Quebec is in society since it has been in Canada. Every mother has the right to teach her children their own mother tongue. I do not see where anybody has the authority to tell these mothers they have to teach their children the Bible addition, their fate in two mother tongues. I think we would be a lot better off if we just teach them one mother tongue. What-

ever it is going to be, a French Canada or an English-speaking Canada, I have no jurisdiction over that.

In Quebec when they talk about these two founding nations, Indians and French—well, they could have been. I do not know. I was not there when it all happened, but I listen to a lot of people who think they were there when it all happened. I am not going back into the history of everything, but before 1867, I think we all remember what happened in Canada. They had a war. The English declared war on the French culture. They lost the war and the ones that had money jumped on the boat and went back to France; the ones that did not have any money starved in Quebec. They starved completely; froze too. How are we going to eliminate all this? We would have to know how to perform miracles. I have not got that.

Then the British turned around and sent John A. Macdonald and Wilfrid Laurier into Canada to form a government. John A. Macdonald was the Conservative and Wilfrid Laurier was the Liberal. They drew up federalist state for all people, drew up the Confederation for all immigrants to come in and use their own religious organization, their own mother tongue and learn to speak English, or if it is going to be a French nation, then learn to speak French. What is the difference whether it is a French Canada or an English-speaking Canada? It is just up here. Then they formed the federal law and they also formed the provincial law, which makes bylaws come before the federal law. They also set up a Supreme Court of Canada and a Senate. I should have said before I am handicapped in pronouncing my words, but you will pronounce them whatever way you want and then they will be pronounced right.

The problem we have in Canada today is our school system and the only way we are going to eliminate this difference—we have to turn around and get religious organizations or charity institutions—we all owe our contributions concerning the charity institutions. Those charity institutions can get a lot of things set up, but school is not a charity institution. Religion should be kept in the churches and homes, not in schools.

Let's all go to one school and it does not matter what language it is going to be. We are all going to be educated in one language. Then we are going to eliminate all this hassling, who owns Canada, who owns the land and all this stuff. We will eliminate all that by education. The young people today who are going to school, if you ask them what two and two is, they could not say. Lots of them do not even know it is four. So it is all coming in this high technology. It is away beyond my understanding, but there is no doubt we have got lots of people in here understand it too.

So I will say on my behalf, you can take your own inventory and use your own conception of Canada. Use your own conception of God if you want. If you want to believe in Him, it is your privilege. If you do not want to believe in him, it is your business. There is no must that you must go to church; there is no must in the Constitution, any shape or form.

Quebec is talking about separating. How are they going to separate? Confederation represents the whole of

Canada, not just Quebec and Newfoundland, the whole of Canada. We all have the rights, race, colour and creed, to learn to live and respect one another, live with one another. I moved all over Canada—I am not going into all the details—and nobody ever told me that I did not have the right to go there, the right to go here.

Who is bringing all this stuff up? I do not know. There is one thing that I cannot really understand. We have got French Canadians in Quebec, intelligent, lots of them; we have got French Canadians, intelligent females and males all over Canada. Who is bringing in francophones and anglophones? What are francophones and anglophones? You cannot be a French Canadian and be a francophone. And who has the authority to tell me I am an anglophone? I am not an anglophone, I am a Canadian. I got five brothers right here in Sudbury married five French Canadian girls. What are my niece and nephews? Are they francophones and anglophones or are they Canadians? This all has to be sorted out some way or another. I have not got the high technology to do all this.

1700

John A. Macdonald and Wilfrid Laurier drew all that up with the British. They delivered it here. The federal government owns all the resources. They own all the minerals, all the water, all the crown land. So where do the native people get that they own this land? I cannot figure that out. The land that I got, I bought and paid for it and I have not even got the rights of it. If the federal government wanted to run a highway through that property or put up a shopping mall, they would buy me out and move me away. I have not got the rights to that land; the federal government owns it all.

I am going to close off here. This is just my understanding and I am not asking anybody to buy anything I say or try to absorb anything I say. Use your own judgement and try and balance it out and push your federal government. The provincial government has no authority to interfere with these land titles and the native people. They all come under the federal government, and I wish somebody would push the federal government in there and say: "Here, if you don't want to do something, get the hell out. Why sit there?"

That is all I am going to say and I thank you very much for taking the time to listen. I said I would take about 10 minutes and that is all.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Gray.

DIALOGUE SUDBURY

The Chair: I call next Robert Wiseman and Aurélien Dupuis from Dialogue Sudbury, our final presenters this afternoon.

M. Dupuis : Monsieur le Commissaire, distingués membres du comité, mesdames, messieurs, je m'appelle Aurélien Dupuis, je suis le président de Dialogue Sudbury, je suis père de trois beaux enfants, c'était inévitable et je suis passablement actif dans la société, dans la communauté de Sudbury depuis plusieurs années.

Pour débiter, j'aimerais citer de Camus ; grosso modo il a dit : « Si tu marches devant moi, je ne suis pas sûr

de te suivre ; si tu marches derrière moi, je ne suis pas sûr de te conduire sur le bon chemin ; si tu le veux, marche à mes côtés et soyons amis ». C'est un peu l'esprit qu'emprunte Dialogue Sudbury par la présentation qui va suivre.

Vous comprenez que ce n'est pas chose facile que de regrouper un organisme avec un préavis de cinq jours. Cependant, nos membres ont bien voulu répondre à l'appel. Ils sont venus nombreux hier soir discuter de l'avenir du Canada et de l'orientation politique que devrait peut-être adopter le gouvernement de l'Ontario. Nous nous sommes grattés les méninges et voici où ont mené nos réflexions, nos considérations et nos conclusions.

Tout d'abord, je dois vous dire que le but premier de Dialogue Sudbury est de promouvoir le dialogue entre les deux cultures publiques, comme l'a si bien dit un anglophone de l'Est. Nous cherchons aussi à créer une atmosphère de détente susceptible de conduire à la bonne entente, à l'harmonie et la paix ; bien entendu nous n'excluons pas les groupes ethniques et les autochtones. Ces derniers sont les premiers citoyens canadiens. Tant qu'aux différents groupes ethniques, ils font partie de la mosaïque canadienne et nous nous efforçons de faire en sorte qu'ils se sentent bien dans leur peau ici en terre canadienne.

Avant de vous dire ce que pensent les membres de Dialogue Sudbury sur le sujet en question, nous tenons à féliciter le gouvernement de l'Ontario d'avoir pris l'initiative de créer un forum d'expression pour les citoyens de cette province. Nos membres s'accordent à dire : premièrement, que l'on doit respecter les deux langues officielles d'un bout à l'autre du pays sans équivoque ;

Deuxièmement, que l'on doit accorder aux Canadiens, peu importe leur origine, leurs croyances politiques et religieuses les mêmes droits, les mêmes privilèges et les mêmes opportunités ;

Troisièmement, que la majorité anglophone devrait réaliser la situation précaire dans laquelle se trouve la minorité francophone au Canada en général mais principalement hors du Québec, et qu'elle devrait faire un effort tout à fait spécial pour comprendre et appuyer les francophones dans leurs justes revendications ;

Quatrièmement, que les différents groupes ethniques de la province et du pays devraient montrer de façon tangible leurs reconnaissances envers leur pays-hôte ;

Cinquièmement, qu'ils devraient accepter sans arrière-pensée les deux grandes cultures publiques de ce pays ;

Sixièmement, que nous sommes désormais une nation diversifiée et qu'on devra rédiger dans les plus brefs délais une constitution faite sur mesure pour répondre aux aspirations et aux besoins de tous les Canadiens sans exception ;

Septièmement, que c'est en découvrant nos vraies différences qu'on parviendra à les réconcilier ;

Huitièmement, que les Canadiens ne se connaissent pas et qu'ils ne connaissent pas leur histoire ;

Neuvièmement, que la constitution actuelle date de l'ère du cheval et de la calèche et qu'elle doit être modifiée

pour répondre aux besoins et aux exigences d'aujourd'hui ;

Dixièmement, que la province de Québec a une vision très claire de ce qu'elle veut, ce qui n'est pas nécessairement le cas pour le reste du Canada ;

Onzièmement, que les minorités visibles s'opposent parfois aux gains faits par les francophones en matière de droits et que cette opposition n'est pas toujours justifiable ;

Douzièmement, que de graves injustices ont été commises envers les Franco-Canadiens sur le plan éducatif en particulier, et ceux-ci ont du rattrapage à faire. Faute d'éducation, les Franco-Canadiens ont eu de la difficulté dans le passé et même encore aujourd'hui à percer le marché du travail et à occuper des postes de responsabilité ;

Treizièmement, que le Canada doit sans faute respecter les droits et les coutumes ancestrales des autochtones. Nous avons une grande estimation pour ces gens du pays dont les coutumes, les valeurs et les traditions ont été chambardées depuis 400 ans.

En guise de conclusion, avant de céder la parole à M. Wiseman, mon collègue, depuis l'échec du Lac Meech nos gouvernements ont montré beaucoup de bonne volonté et un désir sincère, je crois, de régler les grands problèmes de l'heure à travers tout le Canada. La présente commission en est un bon exemple. Merci.

1710

Mr Wiseman: The Chair will have to listen, because I think my brief is unreadable, but it is brief. The time spent on this was pitiful, but we will have it typed for you in the next day.

First, on behalf of our organization, Dialogue Sudbury—for those of you who did not understand the French language, Dialogue Sudbury is what it says, an organization giving dialogue to try to find out what each other's problems are and to help if possible. On behalf of our organization, I commend the government of Ontario and the commission for soliciting input from your constituents in these difficult times.

We have a vision of one country, indivisible, with 10 provinces plus two territories united, where there is equality and justice for all. There needs to be a strong central government with laws to enforce respect of the rights of the individual in both official language groups as well as in all minorities. Equality of opportunity in the workplace follows only from equal access to educational facilities. Tolerance and friendship has to be encouraged from both anglophone and francophone towards other minorities. Of course, for justice and equality for all we need all the help we can get from the provincial government in encouraging this.

We know the biggest hurdle is the feds. The province must enforce the federal laws so that minorities are not disadvantaged. This means that minority francophone and anglophone rights at times must be protected in areas where their particular population is small. Education can be restandardized. In my own opinion, I believe it should go back to mandatory French and English, and as well,

where feasible, let's have heritage languages too. We already have this in the universities.

The provincial government must educate and inform the people as to the workings of the government more than it does, and both governments must tell the whole truth. If you are responsible and loyal, what have you got to hide? Credibility gaps occur from half-truths and covert actions. You must be open and honest to be considered honest.

The real issues of the first peoples of our nation must be addressed. Help solve his problems and he can help solve ours, particularly with nature and the environment. There again, the main holdup is the federal government.

We all need a vision of the future that is not short-sighted with respect to the environment, future generations, peace and many other problem areas. Listen to women, another minority group, at least the ones who are allowed to be active, and do not make them fight for equality. The increase in the percentage of women in the present provincial government is very heartening, but what about here? Two of 17: that is only 12%. They have much better peripheral vision and are not nearly as shortsighted as men. Women tend to worry more, starting in the home. They are usually more responsible in the home, and I think it goes without saying that they are more responsible in government. Support especially competent women and make it easier for them to take an active role in our provincial government and the rest will probably take care of itself.

Encourage Quebec to communicate its fears. I understand many of the fears and concerns of my anglophone friends, and they are real, but based on sensation often, and minor incidents. Give us the whole truth now. But it is probably already too late; the talk about the secession of Quebec is pretty strong. Since the law on two official languages was first enacted, some catch-up by the francophones has occurred and has produced concerns. These have been exaggerated, and sometimes this has occurred needlessly from too aggressive implementation of the new laws—and it is not always done by francophones.

Let us have dialogue and friendships, not one-sided half-truths. The challenge is with each of us as well as for the provincial government. Sudbury has approximately 30% each of anglophone and francophone and we must be friends and supported as such by our provincial government. We need a francophone university in the north. Compared to the billions of dollars we waste annually in the federal government in servicing the debt, why would anyone complain about a university for francophones in the north? It is money well spent. The promised services for anglophones must come, but surely without incurring malice.

Let us encourage and have tolerance starting with our children, and have partnerships, man and woman, starting in the home. Let's be neighbours in the community and let's encourage friendship throughout Ontario, the nation and the world.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I really want to congratulate both of you. Could you tell us a little more about your organization? You seem to have solved a lot of problems that we hope we will be able to offer recommendations on. I would

like to know if you have a constitution, the size of your membership, whether you have regular meetings, just very basic things, because I really do think you are a model.

Mr Wiseman: We have only 30. We are very new. We do not have a charter. What we are learning on both sides is that the causes of all these fears, many of them, are not real, generated from half-truths.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you used this book for your discussion, *Changing for the Better*, the book we are using?

Mr Wiseman: I phoned and asked for one. There will be one filled out by myself and I am encouraging other people to fill it out too.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We thank you very much. I am very pleased you are going to present your thoughts to us in writing.

Mr Bisson: First, my colleague says she really appreciates the comments you made regarding women, something we obviously need to do a lot more on.

My question is very short. The most important underlying theme of what you are talking about is that by dialoguing and by talking to each other and trying to explain each other's differences—yes, that means at times that we get hot-tempered and fight a little. We as Canadians are very good at that, we have a good history of fighting among each other and at the end of it coming to some sort of consensus and building a more caring society. You talked about dialogue and the importance of that, because at the end of the day you were able to better understand each other and each other's position.

But then you touched very shortly on the fact that the media also has a responsibility with regard to trying to report this, an issue as important as the dilemma we are in right now, in such a way that it is not sensationalism. One argument that could be put forward is that the media, because we are a democratic society, have the right to report the news as they see fit. How do you protect the rights of the media, because we are in a free and democratic society? Where do you draw the line? I understand what you are saying and I agree with you, but also we have to say to the media that we recognize that it is a democratic society

and they must report the news the way they see it. What wisdom can you give them and where do you draw the line?

M. Dupuis : Pour commencer, les membres de Dialogue Sudbury ne sont pas nécessairement d'accord sur tous les sujets. Il y a au sein de Dialogue Sudbury des contradictions ; nous ne sommes pas toujours d'accord mais au moins nous avons cette volonté d'écouter ce que l'autre a à dire. Je crois que ceci est important parce que si on se ferme les oreilles, si on ne veut rien entendre, on n'apprendra jamais rien au sujet de l'autre et vice versa.

Quant à votre référence sur les médias, je crois que les médias parfois vont un peu trop loin et exagèrent l'importance de certaines activités au sein de la communauté de Sudbury. Je crois qu'on va vraiment trop loin et que souvent, au lieu de résoudre certains problèmes, apporter certaines solutions, c'est le contraire qui se produit. Les gens deviennent négatifs et puis confus et ne savent où donner de la tête. C'est à peu près tout ce que je pourrais vous dire présentement.

M. Bisson : Ce que vous dites c'est que les médias ont une responsabilité de faire le reportage d'une manière qui est égale, donner les deux côtés de l'histoire d'une manière responsable.

M. Dupuis : Oui, de façon aussi responsable que possible.

Mr Wiseman: I would like to say that there is too much apathy too. Perhaps all the media are getting is sensational stories. It is not only the individual member of the constituency who has the responsibility. I believe especially that government, let's say the provincial government, should lead in this. We do not see enough of the facts coming from the government. I believe they should not be afraid to speak out, call it the way they see it. Do not worry about the vote. It will be there.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Merci beaucoup. We will end the afternoon session at this point, and recess until 7 o'clock this evening for the evening session. Thank you very much to everyone.

The committee recessed at 1724.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1909.

The Chair: I would like to call the evening session to order, please. On behalf of the committee I would like to welcome those people who are here in the audience, here being of course the council chamber in Sudbury, for those people who may be following us over the parliamentary channel.

We had a full morning and afternoon session here today and we have a full evening of speakers before us again. As I did earlier on in order for us to allow some of the other people who have indicated, since the list was drawn up, that they also wish to speak, I would ask those people who are speaking as individuals to try to limit their comments to about 10 minutes, and those that are speaking on behalf of organizations to limit their comments to about 20 minutes. In that way, we will be able to accommodate the additional speakers as well.

CARREFOUR FRANCOPHONE

The Chair: I will begin by calling Alain Harvey from the Centre culturel du Carrefour francophone. You can use either the podium or one of those chairs, whichever you prefer.

M. Harvey : Je désire tout d'abord vous remercier pour le forum que vous accordez aux Ontariens et Ontariennes afin de nous permettre de nous prononcer sur notre vision de la Confédération canadienne et de la place que doit prendre l'Ontario dans cette Confédération.

J'aimerais tout d'abord vous lire un poème d'un des plus illustres poètes franco-ontariens, Jean-Marc Dalpé, qui parle de l'enracinement profond que les Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes ont à ce pays.

LES MURS DE NOS VILLAGES

Les murs de nos villages se souviennent
Les murs de nos villages se rappellent
et ils nous chuchotent parfois à l'oreille des drôles
d'histoires.

Les murs de nos Main Street
se souviennent
de nos fanfares, de nos processions de la Fête-Dieu
et de nos parades de la Saint-Jean...
Les murs de nos Main Street
se souviennent aussi
de nos marchés à ciel ouvert et de nos magasins
général
avec le poêle à bois pour les vieux
et leur coup de Gin DeKuyper après la messe.

Les murs de nos églises
se souviennent
de nos baptêmes, de nos noces, de nos enterrements
de nos Noël et de nos crèches où l'on couchait
l'enfant-poupée sur la paille de nos champs de foin...

Les murs de nos écoles
se souviennent
des rangs deux par deux de tous nos visages d'enfants,
des a-b-c à transcrire entre les lignes
sans barbouiller...
Les murs de nos écoles
se souviennent aussi...
de la leçon d'histoire qui commence
"Sur les Plaines d'Abraham..."

Les murs de nos maisons
se souviennent
des mains qui les ont bâtis
et de celles de nos grand-mères
qui sentaient la farine et le bon pain...
Les murs de nos cimetières
se souviennent
de ceux qui sont restés
et qui ne sont pas partis ailleurs.

Les murs de nos usines
qui ne sont jamais les nôtres
se souviennent
de notre sueur pour la p'tite paye
et de tous nos doigts perdus dans les machines.
Les murs de nos usines
se souviennent aussi
de notre première grève
et de quelques vitres cassées
par nos meilleurs joueurs de balle-molle.

Les murs de nos villages
se souviennent...
de nos rires, de nos larmes,
de nos peines, de nos joies
de nos cris, de nos silences,
de la force de nos bras,
de notre coeur au ventre,
de notre parole en sacre et en poésie
et de nos racines dans ce pays
aussi creuses que celles d'un vieux chêne.
Sur les murs de nos villages
dans notre langue couleur terre
couleur misère
Nous avons inscrit nos vies et nos hivers,
de père en fils, de mère en fille.

Sur tous les murs de nos villages
dans notre langue couleur terre
couleur misère
nous avons égratigné à même les ongles
de nos mains sales de travailleurs,
les lettres et les visages de notre Histoire.

Les murs de nos villages se souviennent
 Les murs de nos villages se rappellent
 et si parfois ils nous bercent et nous chuchotent à
 l'oreille
 leurs doux souvenirs...

Au matin,
 nous avons nos terres à défricher...
 nous avons à bâtir
 les murs de nos maisons
 les murs de nos églises
 les murs de nos Main Street
 les murs de nos écoles.

Les murs de nos villages se souviennent
 Les murs de nos villages se rappellent
 nos racines dans ce pays
 aussi creuses que celles d'un chêne...

Les violons de nos villages
 nous hurlent des gigue assouffées de Liberté
 et qui ne veulent dire qu'une chose :
 Ici c'est chez nous.

Ici c'est chez nous et peu importe ce qu'il adviendra
 du Canada ou du Québec, nous serons toujours ici chez
 nous. Il s'agit maintenant de définir ce que nous attendons,
 en tant que Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes, de ce
 pays.

Je crois profondément qu'il est encore temps de sauver
 le Canada, mais nous devons accepter de modifier radica-
 lement notre approche et nos structures. La constitution
 existe afin de définir les paramètres dans lesquels nous
 fonctionnons comme nation. Elle définit les liens qui nous
 unissent et définit la distribution des pouvoirs. Ceci n'est
 pas immuable et doit changer comme la population
 change. La Confédération doit pouvoir se redéfinir.

Il est très important que l'on reconnaisse l'apport im-
 portant au pays qu'ont fait les peuples autochtones, les
 Français et les Anglais et que l'on reconnaisse à ces trois
 groupes l'égalité et l'autonomie nécessaires pour assurer
 leur survie en tant que peuples. Les Franco-Ontariens sont
 en droit de s'attendre à ce respect de base quoi qu'il puisse
 arriver au pays ou au Québec.

Il faut que l'on redonne aux Franco-Ontariens et Franco-
 Ontariennes le contrôle de leur avenir. Pour ce faire nous
 devons avoir : la gestion de nos établissements scolaires,
 du primaire jusqu'au post secondaire, et ce bien sûr avec
 les garderies ; tous les services des gouvernements fédéral,
 provincial et municipal ainsi que les services de leurs or-
 ganismes en français. Il faut la reconnaissance du français
 comme une des langues officielles de l'Ontario ; il faut
 également un financement adéquat des établissements
 communautaires, culturels et artistiques franco-ontariens
 afin de permettre à ceux-ci d'avoir un environnement et de
 rayonner dans leur communauté.

Les anglophones, francophones et peuples autochtones
 à la grandeur du pays sont en droit de recevoir tous ces
 droits et ces services. La minorité anglophone du Québec se
 voit déjà reconnaître la plupart de ces droits. Le Nouveau-
 Brunswick est également en avant de nous à ce chapitre.

Nous sommes la province qui comptons le plus grand
 nombre de francophones hors Québec, nous devrions être
 les leaders en matière de droits des francophones.

Je terminerai en vous faisant quelques suggestions
 pour les prochaines discussions constitutionnelles. Il sera
 important de reconnaître que le Québec est une société
 distincte, qu'elle a des besoins particuliers et que la Confé-
 dération sous sa forme actuelle ne répond plus à leurs
 aspirations. Il faut leur reconnaître ce droit de choisir eux-
 mêmes leur avenir. L'Ontario par son poids démographique
 est le leader de cette Confédération canadienne. Nous ne
 devons pas avoir peur du changement, de la redéfinition de
 notre pays. Nous devons aller au-devant des changements
 et appuyer une restructuration aussi majeure qu'il faut
 pour sauver le pays. Il faut aussi y prendre notre place.

M. le Président : Il y a des questions? Monsieur Beer
 pour commencer.

M. Beer : Merci beaucoup. C'est sans doute la pre-
 mière présentation poétique que nous avons reçue et nous
 vous en remercions. Ma question : pour les francophones
 en dehors du Québec, est-ce qu'il n'y a pas un risque que,
 dans une sorte de décentralisation du pays comme prévoit
 le rapport Allaire, il y a des problèmes possibles pour les
 francophones hors du Québec, et n'y a-t-il pas peut-être un
 certain dilemme pour la communauté franco-ontarienne
 essayant de rencontrer les besoins du Québec, de les ap-
 puyer, mais en même temps d'entendre dire : « Bien,
 qu'est-ce que ça va nous faire pour l'avenir » ? Comment
 voyez-vous cette situation ?

M. Harvey : Ce que je trouve triste peut-être dans la
 question c'est finalement que ça entend que les Franco-
 Ontariens, on leur donne des services, on leur donne des
 droits en fonction du Québec. Si le Québec demeure, on
 leur accorde des droits. On ne reconnaît pas aux Franco-
 Ontariens des droits parce qu'ils les ont, mais on devient
 des otages à ce moment-là. Est-ce qu'on n'a pas été des
 otages depuis le début de la Confédération dans ce sens ?

Je me dis que si le Québec se sépare, il va falloir qu'on
 continue à respecter quand même les droits et les intérêts
 des Franco-Ontariens, non pas parce qu'il fait plaisir au
 Québec, mais parce que c'est notre droit, c'est parce qu'on
 est là depuis 300 et quelques années. On est là depuis le
 début. Peut être que le problème qui arrive présentement
 avec le Québec, c'est qu'on a refusé de dealer trop long-
 temps avec des questions, ce qui fait qu'à un moment
 donné on se ramasse avec un abécès qui crève. On se ra-
 masse avec un gros problème au lieu d'avoir pris soin de
 ces questions-là. J'espère que ce n'est pas ça qui va se
 passer avec les Franco-Ontariens, mais qu'on va s'occuper
 de nos problèmes, puis régler puis s'assurer d'une justice
 équitable pour tous les Ontariens.

M. le Président : Il y a d'autres questions. Monsieur
 Bisson, brièvement, s'il-vous-plait.

M. Bisson : Brièvement, je ne suis pas connu pour
 être bref. La grosse question dans cette situation est que,
 comme francophones, on dit qu'on a besoin de prendre le
 contrôle de nos institutions éducationnelles, gouvernemen-
 tales etc. On a besoin de faire à ce que les services soient
 requis pour demeurer francophones et vivre une vie franco-

phone en Ontario. On a besoin d'avoir ces services en place et on dit que c'est important qu'à un point la province reconnaisse ce fait et déclare l'Ontario officiellement bilingue.

Il y a des craintes dans la communauté anglophone vis-à-vis de cette question. Comme francophone ici de Sudbury, qu'est-ce tu peux dire à l'autre communauté pour essayer de répondre aux craintes ? C'est la grosse affaire. Des fois on ne comprend pas totalement la position de l'autre communauté, de la même manière que la nôtre est pas comprise.

1920

M. Harvey : Je pense qu'au niveau de l'autre partie de la population — on peut les diviser en deux. Il y a des anglophones qui sont prêts à écouter puis il y a ceux qui ne sont juste pas prêts à entendre, qui ne sont pas prêts à discuter. Je crois que si tu arrives à des anglophones avec des faits, avec réellement ce que c'est que le bilinguisme, ce que ça veut dire d'offrir des services en français : «Non, ça vous enlève pas des jobs», je veux dire que les gens sont inquiets ; «Non, on n'est pas en train de rentrer le français dans... We're not throwing French down your throat», je veux dire que ces gens vont être capables de comprendre. Quand on regarde la situation, mettons qu'on peut facilement comparer, on est capable de le faire au Québec.

Les anglophones sont capables d'avoir leurs institutions, sont capables de les gérer eux-mêmes. Ça se fait dans plein d'autres pays. Pourquoi est-ce qu'ici on ne serait pas capable de le faire ? Ça ne nous coûtera pas tant que ça. Ce ne seraient pas des choses qui vont réellement affecter tant que ça la communauté anglophone. Il y a des ajustements, ça veut dire qu'on accepte que d'autres gens ont le droit d'être différents, ont le droit de faire les choses selon leurs différences, et puis c'est peut-être qu'il y a des gens qui ne sont pas capables de le faire.

Mais je pense que les anglophones en général sont capables de comprendre et d'accepter ça. C'est évident qu'il existe présentement en Ontario des groupes qui ne sont pas prêts à entendre ou à regarder, qui entendent ce qu'ils veulent, qui voient ce qu'ils veulent et qui ne sont pas prêts à entendre d'autre chose. Mais à ces gens-là je ne peux rien faire. Les autres vont comprendre le bon sens, j'en suis persuadé.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Harvey.

L'ASSOCIATION DES ÉTUDIANT(E)S FRANCOPHONES DE LA LAURENTIENNE

M. le Président : Je vais appeler maintenant Didier Kabagema de l'Association des étudiants francophones de l'Université Laurentienne.

M. Kabagema : Je dois d'abord spécifier que mon mémoire parlera en particulier de la création d'institutions postcollégiales en français. Il n'est pas hors sujet parce qu'il prend en compte l'idée de l'Ontario de demain, c'est-à-dire l'Ontario où les communautés francophones et anglophones travailleraient ensemble et où on aurait une élite francophone qui serait un atout pour l'Ontario.

Tout d'abord, je souligne que l'Association des étudiants francophones regroupe plus de 850 membres et elle

a pour mandat depuis 1989 d'œuvrer pour justement faire en sorte qu'il y ait une université homogène française, donc qui est création d'une élite francophone qui puisse se développer dans sa province et s'épanouir totalement.

Sur le plan sociologique, nous dirons que le Franco-Ontarien se prénomme souvent Franco-Ontarien ou alors Ontariois, bref on peut sentir un besoin de s'identifier, de se définir et le fait qu'il a — ça dépend justement, du sud ou du nord de l'Ontario — un nom pour se définir montre qu'il y a justement un certain problème vis-à-vis de son identité.

Depuis un certain nombre d'années, depuis disons une quinzaine d'années le milieu culturel et artistique de l'Ontario est très en évolution. Il y a des pièces de théâtre montées, il y a des écrivains, il y a des chanteurs. Il y a toute une activité culturelle qui se développe et qui montre que la vitalité des francophones en Ontario n'est pas éteinte, au contraire. Elle est effervescente et elle se développe justement à côté de l'effervescence du Canadien français du Québec, du Québécois. C'est une communauté qui est à part entière, qui se développe toute seule et qui devrait normalement atteindre un certain épanouissement. Seulement, avec l'environnement dans lequel ils sont, ils n'arrivent pas à avoir une certaine affirmation d'eux-mêmes, ils n'arrivent pas à s'épanouir, ils n'arrivent pas à se développer complètement.

Nous désirons vivre en français. Qu'est-ce que vivre en français ? Nous entendons par «vivre en français» : étudier, s'affirmer, participer, parler, écrire et créer en français, non pas parce que nous ne voulons pas vivre en anglais, mais parce que nous savons très bien que l'Ontario est une province où il y a la deuxième communauté la plus grande de francophones au Canada. Donc, nous voulons vivre en français parce que cela permettra justement de nous enrichir, d'apporter beaucoup plus pour l'Ontario en entier.

À l'heure actuelle, je prendrai l'exemple de mon université, l'Université Laurentienne, qui est une université dite bilingue. Il y a un grand taux d'échec dans les tests de compétence linguistique. Le français, justement, connaît beaucoup de problèmes. Si l'on se fie aux statistiques rapportées, en 1988, sur 300 candidats, 209 ont connu un échec, c'est-à-dire plus de 70% dans le test de compétence linguistique en français. Un si grand nombre montre qu'il y a de sérieux problèmes. La maîtrise justement du français est en baisse tout simplement encore parce qu'il n'y a pas d'épanouissement, il n'y a pas de développement de la communauté francophone en Ontario.

Je prendrai un autre exemple. En 1989, 276 étudiants sur un total de 389 étudiants, 71%, ont raté. Cette preuve d'assimilation est un des aspects les plus compromettants de notre système. Donc, la cohabitation devrait se faire avec une certaine homogénéité des deux côtés de la communauté pour que chacun puisse évoluer et qu'il n'y ait pas un lexique qui soit complètement mélangé dans le langage.

Il n'y a pas seulement le verbe de Patrice Desbiens — pour citer un autre poète très connu au nord de l'Ontario — qui «trébuche sur la langue». Les étudiants francophones de l'Ontario trébuchent sur leur langue. Cette inaptitude, on doit essayer de l'arrêter, elle doit essayer de

changer. Cette inaptitude changera et pour cela il faudrait justement qu'il y ait des institutions autonomes à nous.

Je vous donnerai un autre exemple, très rapidement. C'est le macaron que le regroupement francophone a créé il n'y a pas longtemps, un macaron qui crie justement le besoin de s'exprimer en français, le besoin, le malaise au sein de la jeunesse ontarioise. Ce macaron symbolise bien ce besoin. C'est un macaron où c'est écrit : «Estie parle moé en français». C'est justement parce qu'ils ont le besoin de le faire, ils en ont envie. Ils se sentent frustrés par ce problème et ce macaron est frappant mais c'est quand même symbolique.

Ce qui est paradoxal dans la Loi 8, pour parler du post-secondaire, du postcollégial homogène, c'est qu'on nous donne le droit de nous servir de la langue française. On a le droit, on nous permet d'être servis en français, c'est un droit acquis avec la Loi 8 mais ce qui est étonnant c'est qu'on n'a pas encore réussi à bénéficier d'institutions complètement françaises. Je trouve ça paradoxal. On vous dit d'un côté qu'on vous donne le droit d'utiliser votre langue, de vous faire servir en français, mais dans un autre cas on n'arrive pas à étudier complètement en français. Comment s'épanouir ? Comment pouvoir justement travailler, oeuvrer de façon complète et représenter l'Ontario ? Je trouve qu'il faudrait réviser cette position.

Donc, je pense que la mise en place d'un établissement universitaire de langue française établira un dynamisme communautaire indiscutable.

Je terminerai en disant qu'il n'y a vraiment pas de temps à perdre, que les francophones désirent ardemment se pencher sur d'autres problèmes, des problèmes plus importants que le problème comme par exemple l'environnement, qui est un problème assez important, les problèmes de guerre, la paix dans le monde. Mais ceux-là justement ne peuvent pas, parce que linguistiquement ils sont entravés, ils ont un handicap par rapport aux autres. Il faudrait y remédier le plus tôt possible. Donc, la revendication première, c'est justement qu'il y ait, comme cette commission, une commission consultative pour la création d'une université homogène en français. Je vous remercie.

1930

Mr Malkowski: I was very impressed with your presentation. It was very well organized. It really hit me. It has many parallels with the experience in the deaf community, in that at Gallaudet University, the only university in the world for deaf people, the written language is English but obviously the social and the educational language should be American sign language. Of course, the argument goes on that in a bilingual centre, do you have English and ASL? But we argue that you need to be proud of your own language.

To get back to the point, I see the parallel in your community that you need to have an institution that exposes students and the community to the French culture and language. I strongly believe that in Ontario we have to support our students who are francophone. If we were to give this positive cultural institution where people could come together and be exposed to the language and the poetry and the artistic community—you seem to suggest

this is long overdue, but what I am wondering is whether the Charter of Rights really guarantees full access to that, if indeed there are changes in the country, and if you feel that is a recommendation we should include, as you seem to think that culture and French studies are very important to the survival of your community. I would like to know what you think about that.

[Interruption]

M. le Président : Il n'y avait pas de traduction ?

M. Kabagema : Non, pas de traduction.

M. le Président : Non, la possibilité était là; peut-être que l'appareil ne fonctionne pas.

M. Bisson : Je pourrais poser brièvement la question, même si je ne peux pas m'exprimer d'une manière aussi adéquate que mon confrère. Je crois ce qu'il demandait indirectement, c'est que lui-même comme individu de la communauté sourde-muette reconnaît la valeur d'être capable d'avoir une éducation dans sa langue à lui, que lui par exemple a fait son université à Gallaudet — c'est une université qui est uniquement créée pour les personnes sourdes — d'avoir une communauté à elles, de trouver leur place, d'avoir un milieu, comment dire, «safe». Je ne suis pas un traducteur, comme on voit.

The Chair: What was the last part of your question?

M. Bisson : Quoiqu'il arrive dans la communauté francophone sourde-muette, c'est aussi important pour les francophones muets d'être capables de communiquer dans leur langage à eux qui est appelé LSQ. Comment voyais-tu ça vis-à-vis de la situation des francophones ? En d'autres mots, les anglophones sourds et muets ont leur langage à eux, ASL, les francophones LSQ, qui est une reconnaissance des deux langages. Comment est-ce que vous voyez ça en parallèle avec votre situation ?

M. Kabagema : Si j'ai bien compris la question, je pense que la situation des francophones sourds et muets est, disons, aussi importante que la situation des étudiants francophones. Je pense qu'il faudrait absolument que les personnes de toute communauté qui ont besoin de s'exprimer à leur façon, qui est particulière, devraient avoir les possibilités d'évoluer d'une certaine homogénéité dans leurs institutions pour qu'elles puissent complètement étudier et s'exprimer entre elles de façon homogène.

Mr Malkowski: It is important that we support the concerns, especially total accessibility in French universities and institutions, to provide access to all the students, especially in Quebec, so they follow the same philosophy we have in Ontario and may follow suit.

M. Kabagema : C'est en anglais.

M. le Président : Il y a un problème.

Mr Malkowski: I think it is important for all the community members and committee members to understand what total access means, especially when we are providing access and funding to federal institutions to look at this issue. Suppose we had something in Quebec, a federal institution and you had it federally run, but also having the cultural exposure and embedding the philosophy of that particular community.

M. Kabagema : Encore, si j'ai bien compris, parce que ça dépend de la traduction, et je pense que vais me répéter, je crois qu'il faut assurer à la communauté la possibilité d'essayer de s'exprimer, d'évoluer dans son milieu. Je pense que le problème des fonds est un problème mineur parce que comparativement à la communauté majoritaire, la communauté minoritaire ne demandera jamais autant de fonds.

On sait très bien qu'on peut développer une université, une institution postcollégiale en français sans pour autant dépenser des tonnes d'argent. Cela est possible. Petit à petit, elle peut très bien financièrement évoluer et au début on n'a pas besoin de quelque chose d'immense.

LUC COMEAU

M. le Président : Je voudrais appeler maintenant Luc Comeau.

M. Comeau : Avant de commencer, je veux juste faire un commentaire au sujet de ce qui vient de se dérouler. C'est peut-être drôle et c'est peut-être frustrant, mais je trouve que ça explique vraiment bien les difficultés qu'on vit en tant que Canadiens francophones, anglophones, sourds et muets. Par contre, je crois que ça vaut la peine. Je pense que ça vaut l'effort, ça vaut la patience, qu'on doit dépenser un peu pour se comprendre. Il faut aller au-delà de ces problèmes de communication.

J'ai choisi de vous parler aujourd'hui à titre individuel, à titre personnel, comme citoyen ontarien, franco-ontarien et canadien. Je tiens à ces trois appartenances et je suis fier des trois, bien que je m'identifie principalement comme Franco-Ontarien.

J'ai choisi de vous parler d'un sujet spécifique, un sujet qui est drôlement important si on veut continuer d'avoir un Canada. Mon message se résume en un mot clé, un mot qu'on doit mettre en oeuvre si on veut continuer de bâtir un pays qui est l'envie du monde. Ce mot-là, c'est «tolérance». C'est une valeur qui est partagée par plusieurs Canadiens. Je crois que c'est une valeur qui nous définit. Laissez-moi m'expliquer.

1940

Le Canada, l'existence de notre pays, est difficile à expliquer. C'est contre les forces économiques, le climat, l'isolement qu'on s'est bâti un pays. Le Canada est un triomphe de la volonté humaine. C'est aussi un triomphe de la tolérance, de la diversité de ses habitants.

Bob Rae a raison quand il dit que si le Canada n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer. Le Canada est un défi humain, c'est le défi qu'on s'est donné de vivre côte à côte. Ce n'est pas facile parce qu'on n'est pas tous pareils. Nos différences de langue et de culture cachent aussi le fait qu'on est tous unique et qu'on a tous le droit de vivre comme on veut.

La tolérance se manifeste quand des gens acceptent que l'égalité ne veut pas nécessairement dire qu'on doit tous être pareils. Ça se manifeste quand les gens acceptent que certains groupes de la société ont le droit de prendre leur place autant que d'autres. Ceux et celles qui sont tellement cyniques qu'ils disent que nos différences nous désunissent n'ont pas compris le rêve du Canada.

Ces vieux cyniques voient nos différences comme étant un problème. Moi, je vois ça plutôt comme une richesse, comme quelque chose à conserver et à promouvoir. C'est pour ça que je crois que le mot clé au Canada aujourd'hui c'est tolérance. Malheureusement, plusieurs de mes concitoyens ont abandonné le rêve d'un Canada diversifié et tolérant. Ces gens-là veulent une seule langue, pas de turbans dans la Gendarmerie royale du Canada, pas d'immigrants. Bref, ils ne veulent rien savoir de tout ce qui ne correspond pas à leur petite définition de la réalité.

Ces gens-là disent que le bilinguisme et le multiculturalisme nous désunissent. Quand je les écoute parler, je comprends plutôt qu'ils n'ont aucune tolérance pour leur voisin qui est différent d'eux. Je crois que c'est plutôt ça qui est dangereux pour l'unité du pays.

Donc, je vous dis que ce n'est pas ce point de vue-là qui doit prévaloir dans la redéfinition de notre pays. Plutôt, il faudrait définir notre pays comme un endroit où les gens ont le droit d'être ce qu'ils veulent être, un endroit où les autochtones, les Franco-Ontariens et chacun de nous pouvons nous épanouir, prendre notre place et nous faire traiter avec respect. Dans cette redéfinition ou restructuration, l'Ontario a un rôle de leadership à assumer. L'Ontario se doit de reconnaître le droit des Franco-Ontariens à la gestion de ses institutions, de la garderie à l'université en passant par les centres culturels.

Ça vaut la peine de le faire, ça vaut la peine de bâtir un pays où le racisme, l'intolérance et le melting pot sont choses du passé, un pays où on reconnaît que nous devons nous assurer que tout le monde a la chance de s'épanouir, que ça prenne des programmes d'action affirmative pour les femmes ou du financement spécial pour les centres culturels francophones ou les friendship centres pour les autochtones, peu importe. On devrait accepter que ces choses-là ne sont pas des dépenses mais plutôt des investissements dans la grande richesse de notre pays : nos citoyens et citoyennes.

La reconnaissance de la dualité linguistique du pays, même si le Québec se sépare, parce que nous on sera toujours là, la reconnaissance des droits ancestraux des autochtones, de la diversité ethnoculturelle de notre population, tout ça c'est essentiel pour la survie du Canada. Ça coûte moins cher d'avoir des programmes de langues officielles et de soutien au multiculturalisme que de se retrouver avec une majorité de la population qui est aliénée d'elle-même et qui parle la langue d'un autre.

C'est juste quand on va arrêter de dire à la majorité de notre population qu'ils et elles ne sont pas corrects parce qu'ils ne sont pas des «hommes, blancs» qu'on va réaliser le plus grand rêve du Canada, celui d'un pays où le respect des différences figure au premier plan.

Il ne faut pas abandonner notre rêve commun d'un Canada tolérant, surtout lorsqu'on considère que la grande majorité des jeunes Canadiens, anglophones comme francophones, y croient. Ne détruisez pas mon pays. Je suis jeune et je veux aider à bâtir un Canada qui respecte le droit d'être de ses citoyens.

Mr Offer: In your presentation, you have spoken about restructuring the Constitution and, if I got one other point in your presentation, you spoke about the need to

recognize two languages and even if Quebec leaves it does not matter; there is still that need.

My question to you—I know this is a question that has not only been posed earlier this evening but certainly on other occasions—is if you might share with me whether, if there is a distancing of the province of Quebec from the rest of Canada, does that not impact on the principle of the founding nations? I recognize there are those who say there are not just two founding countries and maybe that should be expanded. None the less, does it not impact on the principle of the two founding nations, and as a result of this distancing of Quebec from the rest of Canada, so we distance that initial principle, which may have a negative impact on the interests of francophones, Franco-Ontarians?

I would like to receive from you your sense, your impression as to this possibility.

M. Comeau : D'accord. Premièrement, lorsqu'on parle de la thèse des deux peuples fondateurs, on parle d'histoire. Je vous rappelle qu'après 1534, jusqu'en 1867, ou 1840 avec l'Acte d'union, les deux peuples fondateurs, ce n'était pas les frontières du Québec. Il y avait une présence française en Amérique, il y avait une présence anglaise en Amérique qui sont venues rejoindre la présence autochtone.

Quand on parle de deux peuples fondateurs, ça ne veut pas nécessairement dire deux peuples fondateurs égalent Québec et Anglo-Canadiens ; ça veut dire Canadiens français et Canadiens anglais. Dans cette optique-là je crois qu'un Canada tolérant ne pourrait même pas envisager la possibilité de se définir comme un pays, sans le Québec, qui ne respecte pas la langue française.

On parle beaucoup d'assimilation. L'assimilation fait des ravages. Elle fait des ravages non pas parce que le Québec veut se séparer, mais parce que les communautés anglophones du Canada mettent les bâtons dans les roues lorsque les francophones veulent gérer leurs propres écoles, leurs propres centres culturels, toutes ces choses-là. Ce n'est pas une question de soustraire la thèse des deux peuples fondateurs si le Québec se sépare, à mon humble avis, parce que le Canada a toujours été un pays où les gens reconnaissent qu'on a le droit d'être différent, on a le droit de vivre ce qu'on a envie de vivre. Je trouve que c'est peut-être menacé dernièrement, mais je crois que c'est quelque chose qui a toujours été présent au Canada.

Pour répondre à votre question, si le Québec se séparait, moi je continuerais, comme Franco-Ontarien, à me battre pour — Ce n'est pas parce que j'aime me battre, je préférerais juste passer à autre chose comme Didier a dit, mais je continuerais à dire écoute, on est Canadiens. On est tous Canadiens. Les francophones sont aussi Canadiens que n'importe qui d'autre. Donc, reconnaissez qu'on a le droit d'être distincts tout comme les autochtones ont le droit d'être distincts, tout comme les Italo-Canadiens ont le droit d'être distincts au sein d'un Canada tolérant.

M. le Président : Il y a une autre question.

M. Winninger : Je suis d'accord avec vous que la tolérance et le respect sont significatifs. Cependant, le problème pour moi est comment on peut écrire la tolérance et

le respect dans un accord constitutionnel ? Avez-vous une réponse à cela ?

1950

M. Comeau : Je vous préviens, toute réponse que je ferais, je pense tout haut, donc ne me citez pas. Je pense qu'on n'a pas à écrire la tolérance dans la constitution canadienne. Je pense qu'on n'a pas à écrire la tolérance dans les valeurs de notre population. Je pense qu'elle est déjà là. Par contre, je pense qu'il faudrait qu'on reconnaisse chacun comme citoyen, que nos institutions gouvernementales, au cours des 120 dernières années, n'ont pas fait assez d'efforts pour reconnaître le caractère distinct des communautés qui vivent à l'intérieur du pays.

Donc, lorsqu'on parle d'écrire une tolérance au sein de la constitution, ça serait tout simplement consacrer un principe qui existe déjà au Canada au sein de la population ou de la plupart de la population. Tout ce qui resterait à faire est de s'entendre. Que le Québec se sépare ou non, ça peut avoir un impact mais nous aussi on a droit à l'autodétermination tout comme le peuple québécois y a droit. Donc, au sens d'un peuple, ça nous importe peu. C'est un peuple distinct comme les Américains le sont pour nous.

Et puis, je pense qu'on aurait juste à s'entendre pour dire que, dans une constitution canadienne, on veut accorder le droit aux communautés de gérer leur propre avenir. En écrivant ça dans la constitution et puis en reconnaissant comme institution gouvernementale qu'on a des droits qui nous incombent sous cet aspect-là, je pense qu'on libérerait une force créatrice incroyable chez les autochtones, chez les francophones, chez les Ukrainiens canadiens, chez les Italo-Canadiens. On aurait juste à dire aux gens : «Faites vos affaires comme vous voulez», et puis les gens se mettraient à vivre.

M. Winninger : Merci. Ce n'est pas une question simple.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Comeau.

JOE GIGNAC

The Chair : I call Joe Gignac.

Mr Gignac : My name is Joe Gignac and I am from Sudbury. I am here to talk to you a little bit about the deaf community and our frustration with the school system and what it is like for us growing up in a school system which forces you to be oral, a system which is foreign to us. It does not equip us with communication skills. I know of a lot of disciplinary things which happen to us by the teachers. They hit us. It affects our self-esteem and we end up going to therapists later on in our teens to try to reverse this low self-esteem, and this is the fault of the educational system.

Finger-spelling is not a very good way to learn language. We do not acquire the proper English skills. Many of the faculty who teach us do not have the proper sign language abilities themselves. Therefore, the educational system lacks and is not good for us. What we want is to have certified and experienced teachers who know how to teach deaf children. For example, when I was growing up, I felt I suffered in the educational system and that all the decisions were made outside of our family.

There is the total communication system, which is a form of teaching us English, where you say, "The car is broken down," those kinds of things, but in our language the concept is lost. For deaf people, we use American sign language and in our system it is very clear; it follows the concept. So in class you are forced to sort of try and memorize others' rules of English and we sit there saying yes, yes, yes, but do we really understand what is being said? No, we do not. We simply memorize. It is like scripting. We have memorized that little script but we do not really understand what it means.

My first language is American sign language, and when it comes to trying to lip-read people or understand the English language, myself and the deaf community get very frustrated. So when we enter into the community we end up feeling a bit like outsiders. We feel safer within our own culture and within our own community, but what is true is that we often feel that we are 10 years behind the mainstream of society.

ASL is a rich and beautiful culture, but until recently it was forbidden even in schools for the deaf here in Ontario. They used to punish us. They used to tell us: "No, you have to keep your hands behind your back. You have to finger-spell in English. You will have to lip-read. You have to read and write in English." We were programmed to speak English, but they did not teach us language. It ended up just frustrating us and affecting our self esteem.

You see that in terms of post-secondary students now where you do not see many deaf people going on to further their education, so we need to improve that.

What the system seems to be stuck on is compulsory English programming for students thinking that this is the way for us and ignoring the fact that our community is very rich in language. Thank heavens for the deaf community, because without them I do not know where I would have been. They have been a strong resource for me, for my language and for my life experiences. When I want to share my experiences from home or school or whatever, I have those places I can go to where it is safe. It is in my community and my language.

I see the parallels within the French community where they talk about what it is like to go outside that environment and feel a bit like a foreigner or an outsider and know what that feels like, the discrimination, and to know what it feels like to come back to a place where your language and your culture and your values are understood.

Now the anglophones or the people who teach English—I can give you an example. They would say, "Your nose is running." Okay, the nose, and to sign it in English you would have to say, "The nose is running." It would look like it is literally running. But in ASL that makes no sense. You just say your nose is dripping like this, like you have a cold. But if we were to sign it in English, it looks like your nose is running, which of course is impossible, because your nose cannot run.

This is the kind of scripting we have to do, and if you can pass the scripting you get the A and away you go out into the community. But do you have those life skills and that concept in order to use the language? Not really. So we have a concern. We would like to see deaf children

learning our community language, American sign language, learning true language and being able to play with that and then go to English as a second language and then develop those.

For example, if your car is broken down, if you have to sign that in English, a car breaks down, break and down. How can a car break down? In ASL, of course, it is very different. You would just simply sign, "The car is no good," or "The car hasn't passed the test."

These are the kinds of things we need to see happen in the school system. We need to see our language being used in the school system and the community, so that children can learn and so that children can get the kinds of skills they need. I want to see a difference from when I went to school and how frustrating it was for me. It is important for the children of the future. You talk a lot about culture and ASL, and you talk a lot about French and English and the students and young people of the future. Well, we are a community of communities and we are also a legitimate minority within Ontario and we would like to see our rights recognized as well.

We also have some concerns about parents. Often parents who have deaf children—these are hearing parents now—panic because they do not know what to do with a deaf child. Usually their first exposure to someone is someone from a hospital who sends them off to a hearing test or some other person and then they recommend, "Oh, well, get this person involved with the hearing community," and that is called mainstreaming.

Therefore, they do not get to see helpful deaf role models or other people from the community, so the culture is missing. What we need to do is develop some kind of a resource so that hearing people, if they have deaf children, can go to that place and get the appropriate information and can contact people from the deaf community. Then I think that will go a long way to alleviating their fears and their panic and it certainly would go a long way in helping that child to grow up to be a full, independent person.

For example, when I was forced to lip-read and go out into the community, I felt so silly. I felt going out was humiliating, to have to go out, and that cashed itself out in bad behaviour. You see this happening with students now. If you have a respect for culture or a respect for language, then I think you see a positive person develop.

I see many people here today. You are who you are because you had the respect for your language and you had the respect for your culture and you were able to grow up in that, but rob a community or people of that and where are you left? Then you wonder why people do certain things. What we need is your support and your understanding. If a person has a hearing loss or if he is deaf, respect that and go to that. If you look at other communities, whether people are from Asia or Africa, whether people are Jewish or whatever, you need to respect the language and the culture they come from and value that. That is a part of Ontario.

For example, in the south of the province there were rallies to get certain educational changes made in the province. We wanted to hire more deaf administrators and more deaf teachers. We wanted to see some real change in the

curriculum, the principles and the hiring process. Of course, some of you may remember that time; this was last spring. We made briefs and we protested and Gary Malkowski was certainly our leader at that and now that Gary won in the last election, he is our MPP.

It just goes to show you that if you get involved you can do it. Never believe in "no" and never believe in "can't." But what we needed was the opportunity and we needed someone to foster that and to start the fires underneath us, and then once you get going, you are away to the races. So once you see a bit of success, it then inspires other people, and we thank Gary for that.

We have some other concerns with younger people, especially the children, who are in the mainstream schools. Often you have teachers who are in there who do not really know the language. Now the children get to the teens and are there in a school, let's say, for example, in Sudbury. Let's say you have a hearing school and you have maybe a deaf child who is in there and you have people grouped by ages from 12 to 15 and you have a mixture of these people all in the same class. But that is not really age-appropriate if someone is 12 and someone is 15, and it adds more stress for the teachers.

How can they possibly begin to teach age-appropriateness or the appropriate level if they are trying to do four jobs at once in a classroom? What would be nice to see is to have self-contained classrooms with deaf people of comparable age with qualified teachers so you do not have to have one teacher trying to teach four curricula at one time in a class. This is craziness. This is no way to provide education to citizens. This is what goes on. The deaf schools are certainly a place that we value, because that is a place that we see as our culture. That is a safe place where our language can be used and it is almost like family.

2000

I understand the concerns of some parents. They say, "We want our children to be with us because we're family." We understand that, but you also have to understand that your child is also part of a community and it has to be a part of where he can be understood and feel safe.

As well, we have some concerns with some of the mainstream programs and some of the post-secondary institutions. When you grow up and you become an 18-year-old and you have so-called graduated from high school, and they hand you your diploma and congratulations and you are set for life now, there you are with your piece of paper.

Often most of these deaf people who graduate with this piece of paper have not got the literacy skills. We have been misled to a certain extent, and then you are told, "Oh, no, you have to go for upgrading, you have to go and improve your English and your math skills." So we have been sort of misled and we are handed this piece of paper and that again leads to that poor self-esteem. What we need is a better post-secondary education or better upgrading programs for the people who have already come through the system, and we would like to see you do something about that.

As well, employment equity: From my own experience at the school for the deaf in Bellville, if you had applied for a job and you had some experience, for example, if I,

say, worked as a counsellor at a school and I went for the interview, and you have five people coming and four are hearing and one person is deaf, you go through the interview process and usually you are kept to the last, as a deaf person. They have interviewed the first two or three people, but the other people do not have the real experience that they are looking for, nor do they have the ASL skills. I have the communication skills and I have some experience, but I will not be considered. That is because of the systematic discrimination that you see.

Often these are hearing people who end up getting the jobs and they end up learning their sign language skills from the students. This is craziness. How can students be teaching their teachers the language? The teachers should be there as someone of a social role model and be a language role model for young people. It should not be the other way around. It should not be young people trying to educate their teachers in the language.

This is the kind of frustrating situation we see happening often, so that what happens in the school is that it becomes like a trial place for these hearing teachers. It is at our expense as a community and as individuals. So employment equity: In terms of hiring processes I think you need to look at that. We need to see real changes and need to give deaf people a real chance. We thank heaven for Gary and for his presence in the Legislature and for all the work he has done and for fighting for employment equity. He is the first person to really give us hope and to give us a chance.

For example, you look at the counsellors and the teachers who do not have the skills, yet there are many qualified people in the deaf community who can do this. So please, we ask you to take a look at Bill 82 and to take a look at the educational system, take a look at your hiring processes, seriously consider employment equity and pass a law that would say that deaf people are a valued minority within the community and that we are full participants in this society. We would like to be equal participants and would like to thank you for that opportunity, if you will give it to us.

MARIE-ANNE LEVAC

The Chair: We will move on to Marie-Anne Levac.

Mile Levac : D'autres personnes sont venues ici ce soir pour présenter les grandes lignes de leurs attentes face à l'Ontario. Moi, ce que j'aimerais faire maintenant c'est de vous présenter un témoignage personnel qui pourrait quelque peu transmettre l'impact qu'auront vos décisions sur l'avenir des jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes.

Je vais faire ça tout d'abord en vous décrivant quelque peu mon propre vécu personnel. Qui est-ce que je suis ? Je suis originaire de Verner, un petit village francophone tout près d'ici. Mes parents sont Franco-Ontariens, mes grands-parents sont Franco-Ontariens, mes arrière-grands-parents sont Franco-Ontariens et puis ça fait très très longtemps qu'on est Franco-Ontariens. Donc, je suis aussi Ontarienne que n'importe qui ici dans la salle ce soir. Je me considère Ontarienne.

Mon vécu : j'ai fait mes études primaire et intermédiaire à Verner, en français, puis après ma huitième année je me

suis dit que moi aussi je voulais avoir du succès dans ma vie, que moi aussi je voulais même aller jusqu'à l'université, puis en Ontario aussi. Donc, j'ai décidé d'apprendre l'anglais plus vite. Je suis donc allée à une école bilingue. Là j'avais tous mes cours en anglais sauf trois : le français, la géographie, l'histoire étaient en français et tout le reste était en anglais. J'ai appris l'anglais ; les autres matières, je ne sais pas mais j'ai appris l'anglais.

Après mon onzième année j'ai déménagé à North Bay. Puis là j'ai continué à apprendre l'anglais encore une fois. J'ai eu un cours de géographie avec un enseignant qui a déclaré un jour, en pleine classe, que les Français étaient les gens les moins intelligents. Heureusement que j'avais beaucoup d'amis dans la classe, donc je ne l'ai pas pris trop mal, je m'en suis sortie, j'ai fini ma treizième année.

Après ma treizième année je me suis rendue à l'Université Western où j'ai étudié Canadian literature. J'ai eu d'excellents professeurs. Je me suis fait plein d'amis. J'adorais mes études mais après cela, ironiquement là c'est à travers ma littérature anglaise que je me suis rendu compte de l'importance que pouvait prendre l'identité, que c'était vraiment important de se développer soi-même en s'acceptant comme on est et puis comment on pouvait manquer, comment on pouvait perdre à ne pas être ce qu'on est en jouant le rôle de quelqu'un d'autre. Je me suis rendu compte que j'étais en train d'être quelqu'un que je n'étais pas. J'étais en train de jouer un rôle.

Je ne pouvais pas penser à vivre toute ma vie à 50%. Je voulais avoir mon 100%, donner tout ce que j'avais. Donc, j'ai eu la permission d'un de mes doyens de terminer mon baccalauréat à Montréal. Je voulais retourner à ce qu'on entend par «les sources». Je suis allée à l'Université de Montréal pour un an, j'étudiais en littérature française. Puis là je me suis rendu compte encore une fois que ce n'était pas vraiment chez nous. J'aimais bien ça parce quelle est toute française, l'affichage, wow, c'était formidable. Mais les mots «super» puis «c'est écoeurant» puis tous ces mots-là n'étaient pas vraiment mon vécu, donc je me suis rendu compte qu'encore une fois j'étais en train de perdre puis qu'il fallait vraiment que je retourne à mes racines, que je retourne en Ontario. C'est chez moi.

Et maintenant je me vois face à mon postsecondaire encore une fois ; j'ai fini mon baccalauréat. Je vais poursuivre mes études l'an prochain, je vais aller en droit. Malheureusement il n'existe pas encore d'écoles de droit franco-ontariennes ici en Ontario. Je vais devoir m'expatrier au Nouveau-Brunswick. Ce que je donnerai pour pouvoir verser mes frais de scolarité à l'Ontario, je ne vous le dirai pas. J'aimerais bien rester ici avec ma famille et mes amis puis contribuer à ma société ici, mais je tiens à avoir tout ce je peux pour mon école de droit. Je ne veux pas avoir une éducation à moitié en ayant quelques cours en français, quelques cours en anglais et puis finalement recevoir juste une partie de cette éducation. Je la veux toute. Je veux réussir, c'est tout. C'est tout ce que je demande.

Donc, ça me fait penser aussi que je devrais vous dire que je ne suis pas la seule. La semaine dernière mon cousin m'annonce qu'il lâche son programme de musique. Il est un excellent musicien mais les cours à Cambrian sont anglais. Donc, parce qu'il ne comprend pas bien l'anglais,

il ne pourra pas devenir musicien. On a besoin de nos institutions postsecondaires de langue française. Je pense que c'est clair.

Mon avenir est encore un point d'interrogation. C'est vous-autres qui allez le déterminer. Je pars pour revenir. Je n'ai pas le choix, c'est chez nous ici. J'ai hâte de voir comment l'Ontario va m'accueillir.

2010

J'ai des recommandations : que l'Ontario n'envoie plus le message aux jeunes de langue française qu'ils sont des citoyens de deuxième classe en les empêchant d'aller plus loin que le secondaire. Bref, que l'on reconnaisse le droit des jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes de pouvoir poursuivre leurs études en français au niveau postsecondaire en Ontario dans une institution homogène de langue française.

Que l'Ontario, étant une des provinces les plus riches du Canada, assume un rôle de leadership en assumant ses propres responsabilités face à ses propres citoyens, en encourageant la tolérance à l'intérieur de sa propre province et en assurant l'épanouissement de tous les Ontariens.

Que l'Ontario ouvre les yeux sur sa population, reconnaissant que tous contribuent également au développement et au dynamisme de l'Ontario.

Ensuite, que l'Ontario fasse des efforts pour prévenir l'exode des jeunes vers le sud ou vers d'autres provinces et pour minimiser le taux de décrochage.

Que l'Ontario offre des moyens de communication appropriés pour les francophones, favorise l'initiative et l'autonomie des Franco-Ontariens et encourage leur implication sociale, politique et économique.

Finalement, que l'Ontario comprenne que le jour où les jeunes Franco-Ontariens et Franco-Ontariennes se seront assimilés, ce sera le jour où les Canadiens anglais seront devenus Américains.

M. Beer : Ce qui est intéressant avec nos séances c'est qu'il y a des sections de la journée où on ne sait pas ce qui va arriver. Ce soir nous, les membres du comité, avons appris quelque chose d'extrêmement important. Je pense que vous, Marie, Luc, Didier et Alain sentez qu'on a peut-être organisé ça comme comité mais vous nous avez appris un fait très important.

Ce fait est que la communauté francophone de notre province est une communauté qui est canadienne et ontarienne. Un des problèmes que nous avons comme Canadiens d'expression anglaise, comme Ontariens anglophones, c'est de bien comprendre que les francophones de notre province ne se définissent pas par rapport au Québec mais par : «Ici on est chez soi».

Pour tout le monde qui a participé au grand gala il y a un an ou un an et demi, même pour tout le monde qui l'a vu à la télévision, au moment où on a tous chanté ensemble la chanson Notre place, où tous les francophones et même des anglophones — je sais qu'il y avait d'autres gens ici qui étaient là ce soir-là — alors c'était tout un moment de voir toute la foule en train de chanter et dire : «Écoutez, nous sommes chez nous. La province de l'Ontario, c'est notre province. Nous sommes des Canadiens et peu importe ce qui arrive au Québec, on veut certainement

bien que le Québec reste à part entière du Canada. Mais nous sommes ici et nous allons continuer comme ce que nous sommes en effet : Franco-Ontariens».

Je dis à vous tous merci beaucoup, pas simplement de notre part, mais aussi de la part de tout le monde qui regarde la télévision. Vous, les jeunes, tous au niveau post-secondaire, même si nous avons fait des progrès durant les dernières dix années nous comprenons même mieux que des études pourquoi il faut maintenant vraiment assurer au niveau postsecondaire les institutions gérées par les francophones et pour les francophones.

Je pense que vous avez tous parlé du coeur et de l'âme et comme je le disais, vous nous avez appris une leçon très importante.

SUDBURY WOMEN'S CENTRE

The Chair: I call next Cheryl McLellan and Dorothy Zaborszky from the Sudbury Women's Centre.

Ms McLellan: We would like to begin by thanking the committee for providing this opportunity to voice our concerns. We would like to concentrate on an important question that was not raised in the committee's discussion paper, namely, how do we achieve equality for Canadian women?

Throughout Canada's history, women have actively fought to shape society and have struggled for their rights as individuals and citizens. Despite Canada's stated commitment to the values of democracy, very little attention has been paid to the fact that Canadian women are virtually unrepresented in the corridors of power. With few exceptions, the people who make far-reaching decisions which profoundly affect women's lives are men. Women were not persons within the British North America Act and therefore were ineligible to be appointed to the Senate or hold other appointed offices under the act's jurisdiction. It took an appeal in 1929 to the judicial committee of the Privy Council of Great Britain to change this and open the way for Canadian women to serve as federal senators and judges.

The Canadian women's movement has emerged as one of the world's most influential. It has had particular impact in increasing women's participation in politics in Canada, in redefining the public policy agenda and in integrating women's interests in the way governments work.

In the 1960s, a much larger, more critical mass of women began to analyse women's daily lives and to uncover the complex layers of systemic discrimination that relegate women to second-class status. The need for such analysis becomes particularly significant in view of the fact that women constitute 52% of the electorate.

As Jill Vickers has stated:

"The political is not a category fixed for all times in our society; nor does it involve activities located only in formal political institutions which direct their interests to the most powerful levels of the state. None the less, the dominant political culture, with its definition of the political, was established by men and has been made to seem 'natural' with the benefit of formal political institutions, laws and practices that are largely self-perpetuating."

Until the 1960s and early 1970s there was little sense among Canadian women that their potential power as citizens and as prospective legislators could be employed to alter their own status and condition. Perhaps the best example of women's awakening sense of their potential influence was their successful lobby in 1981, which resulted in the inclusion of sections 15 and 28(b) in the Constitution.

The political status quo was male-created and male-centred and as a result tended not to reflect adequately the interests of women. For example, the number of women seeking federal office in Canada rose from four in 1921 to 137 in 1974. But the number of women who won seats in those 53 years rose from one to nine. At this rate, women would need another 842 years to achieve equal representation at the federal level. We note with pleasure that the September 1990 provincial elections have somewhat improved the levels of representation.

None the less, and in spite of the fact that Canada and Ontario have ratified the UN convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination against women, the daily lives of women have not shown significant improvement. A recent review by the UN commission on the status of women concluded that, despite the efforts made during the last five years, obstacles to women's equality remain. Among the issues that were identified as requiring priority attention are: education related to women's legal rights; sex stereotyping; increasing the number of women in decision-making positions; pay equity; recognition of women's unpaid work; integration of work and family responsibilities; and family violence.

2020

We would like to focus on two issues: women in the public service and pay equity. With regard to the former, according to the report of a task force on barriers to women in the public service released in April 1990, women experience significant barriers to career advancement in the public service of Canada, so much so that they are leaving their jobs faster and more frequently than men. This report concluded that women are frustrated by three major barriers: stereotyped attitudes which limit their development and advancement; a hostile, unaccommodating corporate environment; and problems related to balancing work and family responsibilities.

The task force made four recommendations:

Measures should be taken to improve representation of women in senior management. Women make up 44% of the government's work force, but in the upper echelons this proportion drops to 12%. Clearly this is not an acceptable ratio.

The problem of under-representation of women in the public service should be integrated into the government's management strategy instead of being treated as a separate issue. This means, for example, that the performance of deputy ministers could be judged according to their success in reducing the concentration of women in low-paying clerical jobs and in improving their representation at the top.

Rules and practices which put women at a disadvantage should be phased out. In this area, the task force pointed to the use of outdated or stereotypical job descriptions and

the lack of benefits provided in part-time and short-term positions.

A sustained effort should be made to change the corporate culture of the public service. The task force found that 67% of women believe there is a glass ceiling in the public service, an invisible barrier preventing them from reaching top jobs. Only 29% of men perceived such a barrier.

Concerning pay equity the situation is also unsatisfactory. There are several problems with the the Pay Equity Act, Bill 154. The most blatant is that at present about one million women are excluded. Other problems include: job definitions, "job class"; "greater public sector," which has too much ambiguity; and "male job class." Part I, section 1 of the act defines this as a job class in which 70% or more of the members are male. This is particularly problematic because reluctant employers can use it to avoid dealing with pay equity. Because Bill 154 is not equal-value law for everyone, owing to exceptions, it is an exclusive rather than inclusive act. We recommend that the act be amended to include all women without exception.

If Canada is to endure, it must change. To quote Premier Rae, "We need substantial change in the way we in Canada share power, plan for the future, make economic and social decisions as governments and people." This time around, in contrast to 1981 and 1990, women must be present at the bargaining table and not just a token few. We do not need another 1981 repatriation or 1990 Meech Lake situation, both of which, for women, amounted to examples of 11 white males bonding.

A very low priority is given to so-called "women's issues," a term which has come to devalue any issue it encompasses, such as family violence, day care, education, pay equity, guaranteed access to all health care services and many others which have far-reaching effects. They do not affect only women. These are issues that impact on all Canadians. We need to change the mindset that says women's issues can be placed on the back burner and forgotten. These issues must be heard, understood and acted on promptly.

In conclusion, to quote the Feminist Party of Canada: "While it is true that some of the established parties, some of the time, do recognize women's situation and needs, they do so on their terms, in their language and categories, on their time and for their own reasons." We agree with this analysis and would add, again in the words of the Feminist Party: "The political process as it is now practised is not based on human or moral consideration, but on values which, at best, are not conducive to the creative resolution of the problems our country faces. Life, to fulfil its highest potential, depends on integration, on creativity, and politics must be redefined to incorporate these qualities."

Ms Churley: Thank you for coming tonight. You were right when you said there has not been a whole lot of discussion; there was very little tonight, although a few speakers mentioned women's rights, and I am glad you raised the issue. I think you raised a good point.

We must not, as women, when we get elected, all become Maggie Thatchers in order to get to the top. The only way we are going to be able to change the kind of mindset and the culture you are talking about—because we are a

different culture—and get our values in politics and in leadership positions is to be ourselves.

I think my colleagues will say that I tend to do that, and sometimes perhaps to people's embarrassment, because I am being myself. It actually takes a lot of strength and energy to allow yourself to be yourself, because there is a pull to behave properly, which is in that particular male-dominated image. So I am glad you brought that point out. It is very important, and I think there are more women getting, fortunately, slowly, in positions and not being afraid to be themselves. I think it is helping our male colleagues in fact to be around more women in politics.

You mentioned Meech and the 11 men bonding. In fact, there were more than 11 men bonding. Most of the people in that room, the advisers as well, were men. I just wanted to ask you how you think we can do things differently beyond this kind of forum here in the process that is happening now to make sure that women are taken seriously and their concerns, this time, are taken seriously and are once again not left out of the process.

Ms McLellan: I think we have to ensure that women are included in the bargaining process.

Ms Churley: How do you think we can do that? Do you have some ideas beyond people like me and people in positions of power really pushing for that?

Ms McLellan: I just think we have to make a concerted effort to bring more women forward. In 1981 it took an ad hoc committee—I mean, they worked really hard and they did really fine work, but they were not invited. It was not, "Come on, sit down and tell us what your concerns are." We need to have an inclusive process rather than excluding everybody, left, right and centre.

Sometimes, yes, that gets very awkward and there are too many people and all the rest. But when you have women making up 52% of the electorate, should they not have 52% of the say? Should not women be able to express their views on all of the issues and not just say "We'll get her to speak about this because it's a women's issue," which is a horrendous way to do things. I do not know exactly what kind of mechanism we can put in place.

Ms Churley: I guess you hit it, that the Constitution and Confederation and those kinds of issues are seen as hard, male issues and that women are not invited into those rooms. That is the kind of concern I have, that it is very hard to get invited in, because I believe there are not too many people who believe that women understand these issues and there are constitutional experts in the women's community, as experienced during Meech Lake.

I am just asking you if you have some idea. Should we try to hold some kind of women's conference right now or pull some women together who do have some views and expertise in the area and make sure that we do not wait to be invited, that there are women who are ready to be involved pretty well immediately?

Ms McLellan: I think that is what we have to do. There are a lot of women in Canada who are very bright and very politically savvy and who could give so much benefit to the political process. There are any number of

women, and I am sure if an invitation was to be offered by anyone, they would be right there. But we have got to guarantee it.

Ms Churley: Well, you have my guarantee that I will be right there through it all and I think Yvonne will as well, so there are two right here.

Ms McLellan: I think the Ontario government too can set an example. There is nothing wrong with being a trendsetter. There is nothing wrong with Ontario as a province giving women this kind of a voice on a provincial level and saying: "Look how well this works. Look how well represented all of the people in Ontario are and how much our province has benefited from that." Then you can extrapolate that across the country, because you cannot deny that it will benefit and it will be a wonderful example. On a provincial level that is what we can do.

2030

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I am very happy that you came before us tonight, because your suggestions have been very explicit. I have been in public office now for 19 years and when I entered, on a school board, there were 14 members: two women and 12 men. I changed school boards and then I left that about four years ago, and at that point this other board, which was in the same community, was 50-50: 10 women and 10 men. I say that because I do think things are changing. I do think women have to put their names on ballots, and in doing that, they have to ask other women to support them. In the beginning I did have mostly women supporting me, but certainly now men knock on doors for me and certainly my husband is one of my strongest supporters.

I think then when you get into a position of some responsibility you have to encourage other women. My executive assistant is a woman; my campaign managers have been women. I took those people because they had the qualities that were necessary. If they had not had them and if a man had presented himself, he would have been there, but women presented themselves to assist me in my endeavours.

I do not feel that I have ever been told just to speak to women's issues, and I go right back 19 years. I have headed up collective bargaining teams and I have been chairman of a school board, so I feel I have been given many opportunities, but I think that I had to do some sacrificing and I think I had to stick my neck out a bit. I think women such as yourself cannot always wait for the invitation you have requested. I think perhaps Ms Churley and certainly myself—I made my leader aware that I was interested in serving on this committee. If I had not have, he might not have known. Of course, he might not have decided to appoint me to the committee either, but he did and I hope I will be worthy of the task he has presented me.

I just wanted to say one word about pay equity. I think you used the word "promptly."

Ms McLellan: Yes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I have struggled with pay equity now for four years in the Legislature. I do not think there is a prompt way to doing this. Pay equity gets very confused with low-paying jobs and they are two separate things. I think that is one of the fundamental things, and it also gets

confused with employment equity. I hope you will give those of us who are struggling with this in the Legislature some time. There has been quite a step forward, and certainly an announcement yesterday again. I hope you will continue to bring your message to forums like this, and those of us who are there will be encouraged by your support.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

LE THÉÂTRE DU NOUVEL-ONTARIO

The Chair: We go to Paulette Gagnon and Micheline Tremblay du Théâtre du Nouvel-Ontario.

Mme Gagnon : Au nom du conseil d'administration et de l'équipe du TNO, j'aimerais d'abord vous remercier d'avoir accepté de me recevoir ici ce soir.

J'aimerais débiter ma présentation par une citation. C'est un extrait d'une allocution que Pierre Pelletier, un artiste visuel, a fait en octobre dernier lors de l'assemblée de fondation de l'Alliance culturelle de l'Ontario.

Il disait : «La culture qui nous permettait de dire qu'il y a une meilleure façon de penser, de vivre, de sentir, de se cultiver, n'est plus ! La culture comme lieu d'appartenance, comme référent universel à une hiérarchie de valeurs n'est plus. À qui la faute ? Aux artistes, qui délirent de plus belle et qui finissent par donner l'impression que tout vaut tout ? Aux fonctionnaires, technocrates, scribes de la culture qui, obéissant aux mots d'ordre de l'État, finissent par parler d'un bien culturel comme d'un bien quantifiable, d'un bien consommable, qui vaut d'autres biens comestibles, utiles, comme d'autres biens industriels ?

«À qui la faute ? À une civilisation qui nous aplatit complètement, qui nous réduit au réel le plus immédiat, le plus monnayable».

Au cours des prochaines minutes, je tenterai de vous communiquer notre conviction que la vitalité culturelle d'une société est fondamentale à son mieux-être et que l'identité, l'appartenance à une communauté dépend de ce mieux-être collectif. En d'autres mots, sans culture vivante, point de salut.

En tant que francophone de souche ontarienne, par conséquent d'une identité culturelle étiquetée sur la place publique en tant que minorité francophone hors Québec, je crois sincèrement que l'expérience vécue par les Franco-Ontariens depuis quelques décennies peut nous apporter aujourd'hui une réflexion valable dans les débats actuels.

Le Théâtre du Nouvel-Ontario ne pourra se prononcer sur tous les aspects de votre réflexion. Malheureusement, notre expertise se limite au domaine des arts et de la culture. Mais cette expérience est, selon nous, d'une richesse surprenante et, nous l'espérons, permettra de nourrir votre réflexion.

Étant moi-même parent, je déplore souvent l'éclatement de la famille élargie. En effet, je me retrouve souvent seule avec mon conjoint, au sein de ma petite famille nucléaire, à devoir trancher sur des questions fort importantes. Le poids social et économique de mon petit îlot familial est énorme et je dois l'assumer entièrement.

La comparaison est peut-être farfelue, mais il me semble que le Canada est cette famille élargie d'autrefois, au sein de laquelle se développaient les nucléus. Aujourd'hui,

les nucléus sont plus nombreux. Il est de plus en plus difficile de visualiser cette grande famille à laquelle nous appartenons tous. Nous ne la ressentons plus, donc elle n'existe plus, semble-t-on dire.

Ne faudrait-il pas plutôt chercher à comprendre pourquoi et comment notre identité se développe ou ne se développe pas ? Où se nourrit-elle et comment en favoriser l'épanouissement ? Voilà les questions auxquelles je tenterai de répondre en puisant dans notre expérience d'institution culturelle et communautaire, jumelée à notre identité de francophone en milieu minoritaire.

Le Théâtre du Nouvel-Ontario fut fondé en 1971 par un mouvement qui prenait naissance sur le campus de l'Université Laurentienne et qui sera connu par la suite sous le nom de CANO, la Coopérative artistique du Nouvel-Ontario. Pour poursuivre dans l'imagerie familiale, disons que le TNO est un des bébés de ce mouvement artistique du Nord ontarien parmi plusieurs d'autres tels que Prise de Parole, une maison d'édition, Ciné-Nord, La Slogue, La Galerie du Nouvel-Ontario, le groupe de musique CANO et j'en passe.

Vingt ans plus tard, le TNO compte plus de 75 productions théâtrales à son actif, dont 45 sont des créations originales d'artistes franco-ontariens. Plusieurs ont été diffusées aux quatre coins du pays au fil des ans. Le TNO se consacre depuis quatre ans exclusivement à la création de théâtre pour adultes.

Il est un des rares théâtres francophones hors Québec à être propriétaire et si tout va bien, d'ici deux ans il sera le premier théâtre francophone de l'Ontario à posséder sa propre salle de spectacles. Sous le leadership de Jean-Marc Dalpé et de Brigitte Haentjens, respectivement auteur en résidence et directrice artistique de 1982 à 1990, le TNO est maintenant reconnu nationalement et internationalement pour la qualité artistique de son travail.

Parallèlement et en partie parce qu'il est installé dans une région plutôt que dans une métropole, le TNO s'est enraciné dans sa communauté, celle de Sudbury d'abord et surtout, mais aussi celle du nord de l'Ontario. Les liens avec cette communauté sont quotidiens et prennent des formes multiples. Ce que tous ces moments communautaires ont en commun, c'est leur dimension culturelle. Chaque occasion, événement, réception, lancement, atelier, répétition favorise l'expression non censurée, non réprimée d'une appartenance à cette culture qui est la nôtre et qui malheureusement ne se vit pas suffisamment publiquement.

Le TNO répond à ce besoin fondamental de retrouvailles, d'échanges et d'épanouissement culturel.

J'oeuvre au TNO depuis plus de huit ans et j'ai donc été témoin d'une croissance que plusieurs qualifient de remarquable.

En 1981, après une année de crise, le TNO vivait dans l'ordinateur d'un bénévole. Il était sans toit, sans artiste, sans argent. Aujourd'hui, nous gérons un budget annuel d'au-delà de 600 000 \$ par année. Nous créons en moyenne d'une vingtaine d'emploi-homme-année, nous rejoignons des milliers de spectateurs et ce, sans jamais jouer le jeu de la commercialisation, au contraire. Et pourtant nous sommes aujourd'hui davantage appuyés par la communauté que jamais auparavant dans notre histoire.

Je crois, et voilà l'essentiel de ma communication, que ce succès tient à une identité qui s'est bâtie au fil des ans en un sentiment d'appartenance, de reconnaissance de soi qui s'est propagé dans la communauté. Il ne m'aurait pas été possible de dire ceci en 1982 et j'espère que vous ne percevrez aucune vantardise dans mes propos car là n'est pas mon but.

2040

Ce qui assurera notre survie à long terme, ce n'est pas l'expertise d'un administrateur, ce n'est pas un conseil d'administration de gens affluents, ce n'est pas l'argent. C'est cette symbiose artistique communautaire à l'intérieur de laquelle chacun a une place, qu'il ou elle soit un enfant, une adolescente, une femme ou un aîné, une artiste professionnelle ou un consommateur culturel, une comédienne de la relève ou un metteur en scène amateur. Cela crée une grande famille dynamique à l'intérieur de laquelle l'institution du TNO se développe parce que la grande famille est prête à investir. C'est comparable dans une certaine mesure au phénomène des institutions bancaires coopératives. Plus on investit, plus ça rapporte et plus ça rapporte, plus on a le goût d'investir.

Si nous regardons maintenant la société canadienne et ontarienne en général, nous pouvons rapidement constater que la majorité des investissements ont été faits dans les domaines des besoins primaires et secondaires : santé, logement, éducation, services sociaux aux démunis et ainsi de suite. L'investissement des gouvernements, et ce à tous les niveaux, dans le secteur des arts et de la culture demeure aléatoire. Le mythe veut que l'art et la culture c'est une affaire qui ne concerne qu'une partie infiniment marginale de la société. Bref, c'est un luxe d'intellectuels.

Evidemment, je ne saurais prétendre ici que la culture va sauver l'humanité entière à elle seule, mais je comprends qu'aujourd'hui, nous ne cherchons pas nécessairement à identifier les solutions aux problèmes environnementaux, ni les solutions aux problèmes de la pauvreté même si ces problèmes nous touchent et nous préoccupent. Nous adressons particulièrement la question de l'identité et de la définition d'un pays, d'une société, d'un mieux-être, comme le dit Pierre Pelletier, un artiste visuel de la région d'Ottawa.

Nous connaissons tous bien des gens qui jouissent de confort économique, de statut social positif, d'une éducation avancée et qui pourtant ne semblent pas heureux ou ne le sont carrément pas. Et pourtant, d'autres bien moins nantis nous présentent des visages tellement épanouis que nous ne pouvons nous empêcher de nous demander quel est leur secret. Leur secret n'est-il pas un mieux-être, une appartenance à une communauté quelconque, une identité intégrée, vécue de l'intérieur ?

Il m'apparaît essentiel que la culture remonte dans les priorités des gouvernements afin de permettre à une véritable vie culturelle et communautaire de se développer, de s'épanouir. Ne serait-ce pas là un moyen efficace d'aider à notre société à se rebâtir une identité qui lui est propre et par ailleurs vitale ?

Une culture vivante permet aux individus de communiquer, d'échanger, de s'éduquer non pas dans le sens académique mais dans le sens humanitaire. Le problème n'est-il

pas à la base un problème d'ignorance, pas dans le sens péjoratif du mot, mais plutôt dans le sens de méconnaissance de ce que nous sommes ?

Les artistes, c'est prouvé, sont des agents de changement dans une société. Leurs dires, peu importe le médium, permettent à une société donnée de s'observer en quelque sorte, de se critiquer, de se motiver à changer.

Tout le monde s'entend ; ça va changer, ça change déjà. Alors, pourquoi ne pas investir d'abord dans ce qui nous permettra, facilitera les changements de mentalité puisque là encore, l'expérience nous démontre que le véritable changement s'opère lorsque les mentalités acceptent le changement proposé.

Donnons à la vie culturelle et artistique une place, un rôle, une responsabilité sociale importante. Donnons-lui la responsabilité d'être une vitrine pour notre identité canadienne et ontarienne et donnons-lui les moyens de remplir cette responsabilité.

En parlant de la francophonie hors Québec, quelqu'un me disait l'autre jour que le problème est l'absence d'une voix publique. J'applique à ceci un raisonnement parallèle : le Canada doit se doter d'une voix publique qui portera d'un océan à l'autre une identité culturelle propre à son histoire et à son développement. Et cette voix publique ne sera pas stagnante, puisqu'elle sera toujours nourrie à la base par tous ceux et celles qui le bâtissent, ce pays, jour après jour. Au contraire, elle sera créatrice de changements puisqu'elle confrontera constamment chacun de nous au besoin d'évoluer, de s'ouvrir sur le monde, le nôtre en premier bien entendu.

À force de s'ouvrir sur le monde des autres sans avoir une identité propre, solide et vivante, le Canada s'effrite peu à peu. Les francophones hors Québec sont bien placés pour parler de cette réalité qu'est l'assimilation culturelle et la désintégration d'un peuple. Concrètement, cela suppose que les différentes cultures de notre pays et les institutions qui les représentent soient pleinement reconnues. Elles pourront donc être valorisées par notre vitrine canadienne.

Cela demande que la constitution canadienne reconnaisse les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâties le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, anglophone et francophone et leur accorde l'autogestion de la gamme complète des institutions homogènes nécessaires à leur plein épanouissement. En permettant aux communautés nationales de s'autodéterminer, nous investirons dans le développement d'identités solides qui pourront, au bénéfice de tous, faire affaire ensemble. Nous sommes capables d'appliquer ces principes dans nos relations avec d'autres pays, d'autres cultures, pourquoi pas chez nous, entre nous.

Cette vision peut sembler idéaliste aux yeux de certains. Pour d'autres comme moi, c'est une question de valeurs. Je travaille pour un organisme qui à force de rêve et d'engagement a réussi au cours de la dernière décennie à bâtir du solide, une fondation sur laquelle nous pouvons maintenant espérer ériger un avenir. Et cette réussite, nous les artistes, les gestionnaires et les administrateurs du TNO, nous la devons à cette synergie communautaire qui nous projette avec force vers l'avant et nous oblige à nous

dépasser et à réinventer tous les jours une façon de construire un monde meilleur.

Voilà donc ce que je désirais partager avec vous ce soir. Permettez-moi de vous remercier d'avoir reçu le TNO, et acceptez nos vœux de courage et de succès.

Mr Malkowski: I was quite impressed with your talk this evening pertaining to culture and the arts. I think where we have elementary school levels involving in the arts, that has an impact with education, especially when you talk about the French audience members, when you have a bus tour or something, when you have different community groups looking in. Of course they go for leisure. Look at mime; the French are known for that. There is no language, but does that help? From your experience, do you see any positive reactions to that, when people attend arts presented in English and sometimes they do not really display the feelings and spirit of the francophone community?

Ms Gagnon: Am I understanding right, that you are asking how I feel if I see a performance in English and it does not reflect my culture?

Mr Malkowski: That could be. But you talk about your theatre group and people talking and presenting mime. Let's look at mime. Those who are watching are the English audience members. Do they enjoy mime as much as you do? Do they have that open understanding and understanding of the French presentation, and do you get a positive response?

Ms Gagnon: I have to admit I am not very familiar with mime, because that is not the kind of theatre we do. I have anglophone friends who do not really speak French and have been to some of our plays that are totally in French, and they were able to appreciate it and to feel a communication, a bonding with our culture. I do not know how I should say that. They can understand, they can feel, they can react to what is expressed.

Mr Malkowski: So that would encourage other actors to promote more of the arts and culture and then gain respect within your community?

Ms Gagnon: Yes. I think the more the culture is present, vibrant, in our everyday life—I find the problem now is that people go out once every second month to a movie or play, or a school has a play in its school twice a year. It is not everywhere that the cultural identity is present, is felt by the students in schools, the people in society. Culture is almost something that as a consumer we go out and buy when we feel like it, and I do not think that is what culture is all about. I think culture is something present every day. It has to be there. We have to have more arts and more culture in public spaces, we have to have more arts and culture in the schools, we have to have textbooks in the schools that are going to reflect a cultural identity. Why do we not learn science from a Canadian perspective? Why do we not learn math? Anything we learn should be filled with this cultural identity which is ours, anglophone for anglophone and francophone for francophone.

2050

Mr Martin: I just want to share with you that as I sit through these hearings I sense it is an awesome task, a

very big responsibility. If we are going to find an answer, somehow there has to be some magic to it, something that attracts us as people of every cultural origin. Tonight I hear you say some things that were said last night by some people; I sense they were also from a community of artistic types. You speak a language and use words we do not often hear—one of them is “family”—and you speak of concepts.

I come from an Irish culture and I have married an Italian who comes from an Italian culture, and when I was in university I interacted with French culture, and all of that excites me and draws me to something much bigger and much more exciting which I think Canada could be. How do we bring the cultures together to share on the level you have shared with us tonight, so that we may all get excited and resonate together and evolve into a country that feels proud of its differences at the same time as it does things as a community?

Ms Gagnon: I think what I am trying to express here is that our own culture is not visible enough. The American culture is very, very present in our everyday lives. I feel that whether we are Italian Canadian or French Canadian or native people we have all this cultural richness here in Canada and we cannot see it. It does not show that we have all this richness in our cultural heritage. I find that if culture and the arts were a more important priority for the governments, if more money, if more resources, if more services, if more visibility or recognition were given to culture and the arts, I think it would naturally evolve to a stronger Canadian identity, and that should help us figure out a lot of our other problems.

What I am saying here is that as long as we do not have this identity, we are consuming Canada, we are not living it. We have to get inside Canada. It has to mean something from the inside, not just: “Well, I’m going to go and collect this. I hope to get this service,” and expecting everything to come to me as a consumer. That is a very unnatural way of having a relationship with our country. We see our government as something that is supposed to give us. We have to build up identity again. We see many small things having success. With my theatre company, it is this spirit of belonging that gave us that strength to go further and surmount the obstacles, which were enormous considering our small size.

M. Winninger : Est-ce que vous avez considéré le théâtre comme un moyen de présenter le drame constitutionnel ?

Mme Gagnon : Ça pourrait faire un succès dramatique.

SUDBURY MULTICULTURAL/FOLK ARTS ASSOCIATION.

The Chair: I call Sam Enver, from the Sudbury Multicultural/Folk Arts Association.

Mr Enver: On behalf of the 35-ethnic-group membership and individuals of the Sudbury Multicultural/Folk Arts Association, we welcome you to Sudbury.

We wish to express our solidarity with the principles of democracy, which is the basis of your visit here. We firmly believe in the idea of a Canada held together by a strong federal system. We believe in a united Canada and are proud to belong to a country whose multicultural policy is

one of the most progressive in the world. We strongly support the concept of a multicultural mosaic in which the various components can maintain their distinct heritage, cultures and languages within the framework of a Canadian lifestyle.

The present immigration policy is undoubtedly informed by the need to maintain a healthy balance of workforce in the face of a declining Canadian population. The contribution of immigrants to the development of a viable Canadian economy is a well-known fact. Over the years these groups have proven themselves to be highly adaptable in their willingness to acquire new language and other skills, and some have gone on to become very successful in their chosen endeavours. There is no questioning the fact that they will continue to make significant contributions in the future.

One of the dangers of our present system of immigration is the ghettoization of ethnic groups in large urban centres like Toronto. In time this usually leads to ethnic and racial problems, isolation and alienation from the mainstream group. It also defeats the cultural mosaic policy of having groups remain part of the bigger picture.

A better solution would be to spread immigrants more evenly throughout the province and the country. This means making northern cities like Sudbury become more attractive as final destinations for immigrants. It means the decentralization of government and industry to create the jobs and infrastructure necessary to bring about proper development.

Northern Ontario should be made more hospitable by channelling not only independent immigrants and government-sponsored refugees but also people from other parts of Canada. Such people need decent jobs and housing. We need to attract skilled immigrants and business entrepreneurs, and take steps to keep up the population.

A major problem facing the north is the movement of young people away to other parts of the country. The main reason is the lack of jobs, not the weather. With a package of incentives and programs, we can reverse this flow and bring in young immigrants with children as well as keeping our youth. This is the only way to ensure ourselves enough of a working population as a tax base for the future.

A large portion of the immigrants to Canada are not urban-based in their country of origin. It is an additional shock for them to have to learn to live in intimidating urban jungles as well as tackling a new language, climate, culture, education and legal system. We feel many immigrants would find it easier to settle down in smaller, less intimidating communities such as are found in northern Ontario. It would mean for them less of a culture shock, avoidance of urban ghettos, better schools for their children and a greater integration into Canadian life.

The multicultural centre is seeking to do in an organized manner what immigrants of the past did on their own, which is to build up the region. Our staff, paid through government funding, help immigrants to settle in Sudbury, find employment, learn English as a second language and find a circle of supportive people from a familiar culture.

Over 35 organizations representing ethnocultural groups are affiliated with the multicultural association. They maintain the heritage cultures, language and religious

practices and so offer a mental and physical support for the immigrant. We know the first year is the most important for any immigrant, who requires more than anything else the support of those similar to him. The multicultural/folk arts association seeks to provide the nourishment for such support groups to flourish.

Through our cross-cultural education and other similar programs, we hope to educate the general public about the cultures of the many people who make up this community. We feel it is important to eliminate the myths about immigrants, natives and their contributions.

2100

Sudbury is one of the few communities in Canada where there is an umbrella organization that serves the purpose of all ethnic cultures and provides the opportunity for newcomers to receive support of their own culture and at the same time gain access to the social services. We have many programs in place, such as employment counselling, settlement, cross-cultural education and bridging initiative, which serve to educate the public about the cultures of the many peoples who make up the community and help to ensure understanding and harmony. Our board and staff are hard-working, dedicated and qualified individuals from a wide range of ethnic and professional backgrounds.

Regrettably, most of our funding is program-based and short-term, as well as being considerably lower than that of government employees in comparable positions. The province should consider permanent funding and pay equity for what is really a most important instrument for keeping up the province's working population and creating an atmosphere of racial and cultural tolerance and harmony.

In Sudbury, other immigrant support services include career preparation for immigrants, Capri for short, which serves to imbue newcomers with job-specific language skills, and organizations such as Women Across Cultures, an organization that seeks to advocate for the rights of the immigrant woman. We enjoin you to use your good offices to bring pressure to bear and ensure their support and growth.

We feel the rights of all minority groups should be respected. This includes native people and francophones as well as groups like the Italians, Ukrainians, Poles and others from Africa, Asia and Latin America. We believe in a Canada where the rights of all groups are respected—mainstream, native and ethnic—and all have a common say in the future. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir. There is at least one question, maybe two. Mrs O'Neill.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much. It certainly is uplifting to read a brief such as yours. I just wanted to ask you a couple of questions. You have given us a very good idea of what you do together. Could you say a little bit about what you do in heritage language? Do you have a common professional development for your teachers?

My second question has to do with interpreting in the hospitals and social service agencies. Do you branch out into those areas as well?

Mr Enver: Maybe I should start with your second question first. We have a list of interpreters of more than 140 people, and they are all volunteers. When they are required, whether they are required in hospitals or an appeal hearing for a refugee or anywhere, we get in touch with them and we tell them where they should be, and most of the time they are willing to do it and able to do it.

As for our heritage language programs, we support our member groups individually for the programs they do provide. The centre itself has a volunteer program where we get in touch with the Catholic school board in the city and they provide us with a teacher, they donate her services, and we do provide English as a second language at the centre.

We also have Canadian citizenship classes. After three years, most of the immigrants are proud to become Canadians and they want to get ready. We do help them with that and we give them necessary information as to how they should go through with that.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I represent one of the ridings in Ottawa, Ottawa-Rideau, and we are setting up our first multicultural resource centre. I hope you will encourage them, and perhaps I should suggest a visit to this community because you do seem to have a very good hold on the best way to serve your constituents. I thank you very much for coming before us tonight. We need to hear about all these kinds of experiences that are positive within our communities.

Mr Enver: Thank you. On that note, Mr Chairman, if I may, we do have one of the biggest resource libraries in our centre. If the community in Ottawa wishes to borrow some books or it wants to come in here and get some information from our centre, we would be glad to provide it free of charge.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much. I will be taking this message back tomorrow to Ottawa.

Mr Beer: We have had some people come before us who have said specifically that at the root of a lot of the problems in this country are the policies that the governments have followed around bilingualism and multiculturalism. It has always seemed to me that as a country, if we have difficulty accepting two languages, how much more difficult then to accept many cultures, many races, and the kinds of problems then become even greater.

I am wondering from your own experience and certainly the history of your centre here—I mean, Sudbury was one of the first to actually develop a multicultural centre where you brought many people together in terms of supporting all of the different communities—what changes have you seen and what is your sense of the capacity of Canadians to accept this concept of multiculturalism and multiracialism? I mean that not in the sense of the traditional dinners and foods, all of which are important and pleasant, but in the real sense of how that in fact is helping people who come to our country to maintain the respect for their own culture and yet play a full life within Canadian society. Is that changing? Do you find you are still sort of beating your head against some of these same problems as you perhaps did 10 years ago, or do you think

that, even given our problems, we are making progress here and there is a greater acceptance for difference?

Mr Enver: I am looking at the multicultural centre. It has been in existence, you are right, about 25 years, maybe more than 25 years, in the city, and I guess when we were first formed we only had volunteers working in there, and thanks to I guess both levels of government, through their funding we employ today nine persons working at the multicultural centre and they come from different walks of life.

When you deal with minority rights, it is a sensitive situation and you are open to racism, shall we say. Regardless what you do, a very small percentage of the people are racist and you expect to get backlashes in what you are doing trying to promote multiculturalism. But we do tackle it and in the last few years we have taken a proactive position. We have a cross-cultural educator, for example, who prepares packages, goes to different schools with various volunteers with him and they make presentations on Pakistan, for example, or South America. I went to a few schools myself personally and I talked about my culture as a Turkish background.

Some people, for example, look at the Middle East and they say they are all Arabs or they are all Iraqis or they are all Iranians. We try to better educate people that it is not so. In the Middle East you have various cultures and many nationalities, so you cannot really put them in one basket. So in those areas we are improving, and Sudbury, a small community, is giving us a lot of access to the local media and we are promoting in those areas and we are blessed with that.

In recent developments, for example in the Gulf crisis, we were able to attend two television programs and make presentations. Our cross-cultural educator prepared a specific package on the Gulf crisis and we are going to schools and talking about them, so we are improving. We have come a long way, but we still have a long way to go, I guess.

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much. We will end with that.

DANIEL BROUILLETTE

The Chair: I call Daniel Brouillette. Could I just check while Mr Brouillette is coming forward, that is the last speaker we have on the list. We just want to be sure there are not any other people who had expected to speak. If there are, could they make themselves known to the clerk, please. I think that is, as far as we know, the end of our list.

Mr Brouillette: Good evening. I appreciate this opportunity to express my views on the current position of Ontario as it relates to the rest of Canada. I sincerely hope my comments will be more than just heard, but also listened to as well. It has been a long night. I am extremely sceptical that the government will actually act on my advice, or on other people's advice, for that matter. My comments for the most part follow the general outline of the discussion paper.

2110

To be truthful, I believe Canada is currently going through difficulties within because there are few diversions with which we the people can occupy ourselves. Initially, colonists were concerned merely with survival, then with a form of government. There was a railway to build and trouble with our native people, not to mention dealing with our large southern neighbour. All the while there was money to be made through the exploitation of the land on which we lived. The wars then came, and after the second one was over, new technology arrived and world peace seemed possible.

However, people are curious. In their continuous search to find problems to solve, they have dug up some real old bones. Since survival is no longer a major concern, we are now dealing with many questions regarding socialization and self-actualization. As diverse as Canada's culture is, so as well are our ideas of what the country represents and what it should be.

While many English Canadians share similar viewpoints, Quebec itself continuously feels threatened by change sculptured by the English majority. It is therefore hoping that through sovereignty it will be able to return to the past, when France itself was a world power. This belief is somewhat questionable.

The most common value we share as Canadians is our universal desire for financial stability and success. In order to ensure that this is realized, certain steps must be taken and certain principles adhered to. Strong economies are not based on waste, laziness or ineptitude. Eastern countries value work and take great pride and personal satisfaction in what they do, rather than simply the money they earn. This is one reason for their enormous success and increasing ability to compete in a world market.

Canadians have been following the lead of governments for years and have assembled many of their values from what they have observed. When they see corruption, pork-barreling and waste, they are inclined to question the value of honest work and instead concentrate on rewards. It is self-defeating. It lowers standards and productivity in the workplace and makes it more difficult for Canada to compete.

Although we share a common desire to improve our standard of living, some provinces enjoy a much better economy than others. Ontario's wealth is shared with the less affluent provinces like Newfoundland and Quebec. This is questionable, because while Newfoundland uses these subsidies simply to survive and fully acknowledges its need, Quebec takes subsidies as well but then ridicules other provinces for being poor. When Bourassa mentioned this during the Meech Lake debate, when he started picking on Newfoundland for being ignorant and said it should not have an opinion because it was getting free moneys, it really upset me and I think it upset a lot of Canadians. I think Bourassa owes an apology to the maritime provinces.

We need a more competent government which spends wisely and reduces waste, not one which provides or promotes French within the Inuit communities in the northern regions.

We now come to the question of roles of the provincial and federal governments and what they should do for our country. If we wish to retain our identity as a country, the federal government must maintain some control over such areas as health care and education in order that some universal standards are shared throughout and to ensure that Canadians are all treated equally.

If the provincial governments adopt their own policies regarding programs, they will not always coincide the our bill of rights. Quebec is another example. Their desire for group rights sometimes oversteps their ideas of individual human rights. It is not only Quebec that is like this. Other provinces might have reasons not to adhere to common principles which Canada should have. We cannot allow Canada's diversity to make a mockery of our basic principles.

We cannot discuss the values and concerns of Canada without giving some consideration to native peoples and the part they play in this country. They have long been ignored and we can no longer afford to turn a deaf ear to their voice. They must be given a forum in order to express their concerns and they must be given a more important role in the country's future.

We should approach native leaders with more respect and interest and less fear and preconceived notions. They should be invited to participate more in Canadian policy and their ideas concerning self-government should be examined thoroughly. If there are problems integrating their ideas with our own, I am sure they can be worked out. We should rely on their ability to understand their own concerns and let them show us how they would like to proceed. We have become so engrossed with the English and French language issue that other important matters such as native concerns have been ignored. We must give these concerns more attention or the domestic problems will certainly increase.

Now to the French-English issue. When people are worried or threatened, they react. The people of Quebec are afraid that the French language will die, so they are bending and breaking some Canadian rules to increase the odds of its survival. They are considering separation as a means of preserving their culture, and while it is a rash move, if they want to do it, they should be entitled to it.

Seeing this historical division, politicians across Canada have attempted to appease Quebec in various ways. Federally, Trudeau established bills which made Canada officially bilingual, while in Ontario David Peterson came up with the brainchild of Bill 8. These were merely small diversions which kept Quebec interested. Quebec never wanted the rest of Canada to speak French, but since the governments were offering, there was no point in refusing.

These politicians did not solve the French concerns, but they created a number of problems for English-speaking Canadians. English people feel that they are now being discriminated against and that, when they speak out, they are labelled as racist. People are genuinely concerned. They see almost all government jobs going to French-speaking people; everything from librarians to groundskeepers. The English language has long acted as a bridge for many diverse languages in our country, enabling people to learn one language and communicate effectively with others.

Now all people from various cultures must learn not one but two if they wish to fully integrate. This puts an unreasonable burden on these minorities and makes it extremely difficult for them to preserve their own language.

Bill 8 and official bilingualism may please the French outside Quebec but it pleases none of the other minorities and does nothing for English Canada. It also does nothing to lighten the burden of the French living outside of Quebec, since they still most likely have to learn English. Since it only burdens, I must question, what good is it? We cannot lessen the tension between English and French by throwing money at it or by adding burdens to the English-speaking citizens.

The English, long ago, granted the French the right to speak their own language and to promote their culture within the boundaries of our Constitution. The French in Canada fear the eventual loss of their language, but this on occasion is the way of evolution in the world. I believe English Canada has taken a very sincere interest and has done all it reasonably can do.

Concerning the provinces, there has been much criticism of the Constitution, and some of this has been coming from western Canada. I do not believe the problems of western Canada are due to our Constitution, but I believe many are due to the poor administration by our federal government. Rather than renew our Constitution, we might take a closer look at how the federal government interprets its duties and tries to implement its policies, for example, if northern communities are being forced to accept bilingualism although they have no apparent need or desire for it.

Our present federal government uses its influence to promote what individual prime ministers want to promote. If they happen to be from Quebec, they promote Quebec interests throughout the country. Other provinces, such as in western Ontario, often blame the Constitution or Ontario when the federal government itself is at fault. There is nothing in our Constitution that prevents the federal government from realistically appraising the needs of all other provinces fairly, but the politicians themselves may err.

It seems to me that Senate reform is necessary within Canada. The smaller, less financially secure provinces should have more of a direct say in federal matters than they currently do. They must be able to contribute so that they too can prosper like other provinces have already. The bigger provinces do not have the right to dictate to smaller provinces their behaviour. While the House of Commons should not be changed, the Senate should.

I feel Ontarians and Canadians want to be treated equally and they want the opportunity to compete for jobs and to work in a fair society. I think both the English and French would like to take off the gloves and reach some understandings. Personally, I encourage this because the English have been defeating their own purpose for years and this has got to end.

There is no reason for all Canadians to have identical beliefs or values. What is important is that some basics are established which are followed by all. For the past little while English Canadians have been questioning who they are and have tried to search out their identity and culture. For me, this is very foolish but understandable, since many

politicians and prominent people have encouraged this intro-spectiveness and have given us a pretty poor self-image.

2120

We are repeatedly told that our nation is sick and that we have no culture and that ignorance and racism abound. We are told that without Quebec we will become nothing more than a state of the USA. The only thing we seem to possess of value is the money we can pay in taxes, and we pay a lot.

It is little wonder then that Canadians often now measure their worth on an economic scale rather than by their true merit or performance. When the question of Quebec's sovereignty comes to its final conclusion, and if we are faced with actual separation, I hope English Canada can find good, strong representation. When Quebec claims one fourth of Canada's resources, I hope its claim will be met with the reminder that in reality it has long been the receiver of subsidies and favours rather than the giver of them.

They have not financially contributed a quarter share to the country and should not therefore be credited with it. Borders as well will come under close scrutiny and possible disputes, and I hope we do not run true to form and simply give Quebec what it wants. Yes, there will be loss and pain for English Canada if Quebec separates. But they can rest assured that the loss and pain will not be unique to English Canada but will be shared by Quebec as well.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Brouillette. There is one question, maybe two if we can move them quickly. Mr Bisson.

Mr Bisson: This is a personal opinion, but I have always seen one of the strengths in this country as being able to agree to disagree at times and build from that. We are able to come to some kind of consensus in regard to what direction our country should take on various issues. I would like to address the one in regard to when you talked about the Senate. You were saying we need to have reform in the Senate. I think you are right to a certain extent and I think my view is fairly well known; it is basically what the party view is.

The thing I ask you is this: If we were to try to move in this country to the position of having a triple E Senate and having an elected Senate by which you would have a federal election elect to our House of Commons a particular party—let's say the Liberal Party of Canada—and two years later you were to elect a Senate and it would be in opposition—let's say either a New Democratic Party Senate or a Conservative Senate—do you not see that in some ways being no better than the system we have now and in some ways hamstringing the process of the House of Commons?

The scenario could possibly be set up, and I think it is fairly likely, that the House of Commons itself might have some difficulty in trying to pass some of its legislation through. You would almost have to have the Senate and the House of Commons elect the same party in order to pass through some of the ideas that need to be put through.

Mr Brouillette: I see what you are saying. Party lines in the Senate should not be as well defined. People should

be able to vote in the Senate on their own conscience, and in the House of Commons as well. But I do not think that my saying that is going to change it. The fact is that provinces like Newfoundland and New Brunswick and out west do not have enough say. It is Quebec and Ontario.

I am from Ontario and all of my relatives are from Ontario, but I see it as being unfair. In the last debate over Hibernia, Quebec said: "We're not getting enough out of this. We might not let it pass." That is unfair. It should go through. There is no way that one province like Ontario or Quebec—

Mr Bisson: What I am asking—

The Chair: Let's just get the question answered and then we will move on. Go ahead, Mr Brouillette.

Mr Brouillette: Okay, I will redirect it. There might be conflict, but if party lines are not followed, I cannot see it as being as much conflict as there is now. If a person is Conservative but is voting according to what the region wants, according to what the people want instead of what the Prime Minister wants or what the party line is, I think you will have more clear objectives realized. You will be able to do what your people want more.

Mr Beer: I found your presentation very interesting. I must say I was saddened by what I saw as such a despairing sort of sense of the country and a feeling that really there is not much there that can be saved. I guess in particular, and it may just be a conflict in visions, but it seems to me there has been something very noble about the debate over the last 25 years of how we try to bring together English- and French-speaking Canadians, how we try to deal with the issues around a country of diverse cultures and diverse races.

I think frankly just some facts are wrong in terms of the things you seem to be suggesting around Bill 8 and some of the federal government's bilingualism policies. As you look at Canada, do you not see that if somehow this experience in the top of the North American continent is going to work today and 10 years from now, we have to have some basic fundamental respect for both the English and French languages? The francophone community here in Ontario is not a Quebec community; it is an Ontario community, as Ontario as you are or as I am. Can there not be a noble vision that somehow something like Bill 8, which simply ensures that certain basic services are provided and of the 90,000 or 95,000 Ontario civil servants perhaps 5% or 6% will have to be in positions that would require bilingualism, is laudable and supportable?

Mr Brouillette: As you know, my name is Daniel Brouillette. My father is totally French, but I do not speak French. I guess my parents did not see any reason for me to learn to speak French because English is the dominant language. But now I am graduating out of school and a lot of the government jobs are French. The jobs that come available go to French-speaking people, so I might as well forget about the civil service, more or less.

Along those lines, a couple of years ago there was an ad in the Sudbury Star for a job at Laurentian Hospital for a groundskeeper. It said "Knowledge of horticulture and bilingualism necessary." I do not understand that. You do

not have to talk to the grass or to the trees. There is no purpose in that. That is what gets people angry, when they start seeing those jobs—

Mr Beer: But that is the administration of the program. That is management. That is not the principle behind it, which is surely to try to find some way of respecting what we want to do for our two linguistic communities, whether we are talking about somewhere in the province of Quebec or Ontario or New Brunswick.

Mr Brouillette: I do not know.

Mr Beer: Is that not the way we need to look at it and deal with those individual problems?

Mr Brouillette: Respect is one thing, but if you start losing, if somebody actually starts taking money out of your pocket, you are going to be looking around for why it is going, and the simple fact of the matter is personally I feel threatened by the fact that I cannot get the same jobs. The French people in northern Ontario, most of them—well, I do not know any of them who cannot speak English reasonably. They are the ones who get the jobs, and I am left to go either to Toronto—they are talking about the young people leaving northern Ontario. I know a lot of people who are graduating out of my program who are going to Toronto, who are going further down south, who are going into the United States or out west.

There are no jobs up here for English-speaking people, just solely English-speaking. No one is saying what is fair. Personally I do not think it is fair. Most French-speaking

people can speak English so they can get jobs that I can get, but I cannot get the jobs they can get and I do not see that as being fair. I am a commerce student and I understand the way the economy works. Enough French people would be hired through natural hiring processes so that they would be represented within the workforce. I do not know anything about prejudice and stuff like that in the workforce. I do not know how they treat you when you go in for an interview, if they treat you differently when you are English or French. But that is not a real problem that we can solve here, I do not think. That is a bigger issue.

The Chair: Whether we agree or not on whether you are right or not on that, Mr Brouillette, it obviously is a concern that I think needs to be addressed in some way, whether it is the reality or the perception of that concern. Thanks for your views.

That concludes the hearings for this evening and also concludes our hearings here in Sudbury. We have had a long but very useful day of presentations which have touched on a number of issues. We thank all of you who came here this evening and those who came here during the earlier part of the sessions today.

Our hearings continue tomorrow in North Bay and on Thursday from Orillia and Collingwood. I invite any of you who are interested in following our proceedings to do so through the parliamentary network. Thank you very much. We are adjourned until tomorrow.

The committee adjourned at 2129.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 12 February 1991

Roger St-Louis	C-271
John Rodriguez	C-272
Jean Léveillé	C-275
Richard Logtenberg	C-277
Fred and Julie Johannes	C-278
Vincent di Norcia	C-280
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario du grand Sudbury inc	C-283
Sterling Campbell and Lasalle Secondary School	C-285
Le collectif pour le collège du Nord	C-285
Cercle de réflexion sur l'avenir du Canada	C-286
Ernie Checkeris	C-289
Wanda Flis	C-290
George Cast	C-291
Afternoon sitting	C-293
Sudbury District Association for English Rights	C-293
Léo Therrien	C-295
Elliot Lake and District Labour Council	C-296
Jean Dennie	C-300
Clayton Shawana	C-301
Gilbert Gray	C-306
Dialogue Sudbury	C-307
Evening sitting	C-310
Carrefour francophone	C-310
L'Association des étudiant(e)s francophones de la Laurentienne	C-312
Luc Comeau	C-314
Joe Gignac	C-315
Marie-Anne Levac	C-317
Sudbury Women's Centre	C-319
Le Théâtre du Nouvel-Ontario	C-321
Sudbury Multicultural/Folk Arts Association	C-324
Daniel Brouillette	C-326
Adjournment	C-329

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Martin, Tony (Sault Ste Marie NDP) for Ms Harrington**Also taking part:** Ramsay, David (Timiskaming L)**Clerk:** Manikel, Tannis**Clerk pro tem:** Brown, Harold**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

120N
22
990
52

Gouvernement
Publications



C-10 1991

C-10 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Wednesday 13 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mercredi 13 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Wednesday 13 February 1991

The committee met at 1040 in the Royal Canadian Legion, North Bay.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. Thank you very much. We want to, first of all, welcome the people who are here with us this morning. We are of course the select committee on Ontario in Confederation and we are here in North Bay today at the Royal Canadian Legion, where we will be spending some time this morning, this afternoon and into the early evening hearing from people in this community, their views on the role of Ontario in Confederation and issues about our future as a country.

This is, I guess, day 3 of week 2, so I guess it is about the seventh day on the road for us travelling throughout the province. It has been fascinating, I think, for all of us as members of the committee and I think quite useful in hearing the perspectives of people and organizations across the province, and no doubt the presentations today will add a great deal to what we have already learned.

I want to introduce, first of all, the members of the committee who are here. This is a legislative committee that is made up of people from the three different political parties represented at Queen's Park. From the New Democratic Party caucus, in addition to myself, we have Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee, David Winninger and Tony Martin. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus we have Ernie Eves, who will no doubt join us momentarily, and Charles Harnick. Also joining us today is the local MPP from the riding of Nipissing and the leader of the Conservative Party, Mike Harris.

We would like to say, first of all, that we will try today, as we have on other occasions, to hear obviously the people who have indicated already to us that they want to speak to us. We also will try to add as many other people as we possibly can. So if there are other people here in the audience who are interested in speaking to us and whose names we do not have, if you would at some point during the morning let the clerk of the committee, Tannis Manikel, know, or some of our people who will be walking around the room know, then we will do our best to accommodate your wish to speak to us.

With that in mind, if we could ask people to try to keep their presentation to within the 10-to-12-minute mark if they are individuals or the 20-to-25-minute mark if you are presenting on behalf of an organization, that will allow us also a little bit of flexibility both to have some questions asked from the members of the committee as well as to hear from as many people as we possibly can.

MARCEL NOËL

The Chair: With that, I would invite the first speaker, Marcel Noël, to come forward.

Mr Noël: Okay. I think I will sit down here and make it informal a little bit or try to get off informally.

The Chair: Please, yes, do.

M. Noël : Je voudrais commencer en vous remerciant de nous donner l'occasion de vous adresser la parole, messieurs, mesdames, et je voudrais vous féliciter de l'initiative que vous prenez en essayant de découvrir les besoins des Canadiens et des Ontariens en ce moment.

Je voudrais me présenter. Je suis Marcel Noël. Je suis le président de la Chambre de Commerce de Sturgeon Falls et District. Je suis aussi le trésorier du Collectif pour le collège du Nord. Je suis un commerçant à Sturgeon Falls et je suis aussi un ancien fonctionnaire du gouvernement fédéral où j'ai passé douze ans.

Ce matin il y aura deux sujets que je voudrais aborder. Le premier est le leadership de l'Ontario et le deuxième, l'importance de l'éducation.

En ce qui a trait au leadership de l'Ontario, le dénouement de l'entente du Lac Meech a précipité une crise nationale qui va mener à un Canada bien différent de celui que nous connaissons et que nous avions connu.

La position dans laquelle nous nous trouvons, du point de vue linguistique aujourd'hui, découle des événements survenus des pourparlers constitutionnels des cinq à six derniers ans. Il va sans dire que ces discussions ont été désastreuses jusqu'ici et nous amènent au point de décision d'aujourd'hui. Nous voyons à travers le pays des tensions linguistiques épeurantes. Les déclarations municipales d'unilinguisme n'en sont que des symptômes. Je crois que l'une des causes de ces malheurs repose sur les épaules des politiciens, et principalement des politiciens fédéraux.

Le bilinguisme et l'esprit national canadien se développent pendant les années 70, l'ère de M. Trudeau. Il y avait un leadership au pays qui cherchait une égalité et une balance linguistique et encourageait une centralisation du pouvoir fédéral. Nous avons vu pendant cette période une augmentation de services aux francophones au niveau fédéral — voir les proportions de fonctionnaires cadres supérieurs français et anglais et la Loi sur les langues officielles — et au niveau des provinces : le bilinguisme officiel en 1982 au Nouveau-Brunswick et des services accrues en français en Ontario.

Depuis le changement du gouvernement fédéral, il semble y avoir un vide dans la promotion de la vue d'ensemble du Canada. Les poussées fédérales du côté du bilinguisme sont moins visibles et les oeuvres des gouvernements visent plutôt à accentuer les deux solitudes

que de pousser pour un Canada où nos deux cultures peuvent s'épanouir.

Je reconnais que toute la question constitutionnelle est complexe, et que cette question ne se règlera pas sans des discussions très ardues. Mais il reste que les négociations continuent et la bataille n'est pas finie. L'Ontario peut et doit prendre le leadership dans les prochains débats. Les démarches entreprises à date pour les services aux francophones sont louables, mais l'Ontario, avec la plus grande population de francophones hors Québec, doit démontrer le sang-froid et le leadership d'un gouvernement qui promouvait l'égalité entre les deux groupes linguistiques fondateurs de notre pays.

Le pas à prendre pour le bilinguisme officiel demande énormément de courage, mais il pourrait signaler un nouveau départ pour tous les débats constitutionnels.

Je voudrais ici faire un commentaire relié à ce que j'ai entendu hier soir à une séance à Sudbury. Là, il y avait une personne qui se plaignait du manque d'accès pour les anglophones aux postes gouvernementaux. Le besoin de fonctionnaires bilingues ne disparaîtra pas avec la séparation du Québec, si cette horrible option venait à s'exercer, et on espère que non, jamais. Pour des raisons économiques, les gouvernements et les compagnies privées vont toujours avoir besoin d'employés pour transiger avec le Québec et pour desservir une population francophone locale.

La disparition du Québec ne veut pas dire que toutes les positions bilingues vont être éliminées. La majorité des cadres francophones sont aussi des personnes très éduquées et compétentes qui accomplissent des tâches essentielles et sont souvent dans un poste malgré leur avantage d'être bilingue. Je voulais, peut-être, juste dans ce côté, démontrer que s'il y avait une compagnie américaine placée à San José en Californie qui faisait face à deux candidats pour un poste et tout était égal pour les deux candidats sauf que l'un était bilingue espagnol, la compagnie aurait un avantage si elle engageait la personne espagnole pour des raisons économiques. Alors, ces raisons économiques ne disparaîtront pas. Ceci m'amène vraiment à ma deuxième question, le sujet de l'éducation.

L'éducation est à la base de l'essor économique d'une nation. La révolution tranquille au Québec aux années 60 fut le résultat d'un changement dramatique chez les Canadiens français, de l'éducation classique vers des cours commerciaux et techniques.

Dans le nord de l'Ontario, le niveau d'éducation chez les francophones est toujours très inférieur à la moyenne de celui des anglophones. Le décrochage chez les francophones résulte en grande partie du manque d'institutions postsecondaires de langue française desservant la population francophone dans le Nord. Ceci est démontré clairement dans l'étude ACORD et dans le rapport de la commission Bourdeau.

Les inscriptions actuelles au premier collège francophone en Ontario, la Cité collégiale, à Ottawa, font preuve que la demande pour une telle institution est réelle. Le nord de l'Ontario, avec sa forte proportion de francophones, a besoin d'un collège français multicampus pour repêcher les jeunes adultes qui ont décroché et pour former

nos étudiants postsecondaires dans le Nord pour qu'ils y restent et qu'on ne les perde pas aux grandes villes du Sud.

De tels collèges ou campus dans nos villes du Nord assureraient leur survie économique et culturelle, ceci en créant des centres d'excellence dans plusieurs domaines et aussi en devenant le point focal de vie culturelle communautaire.

Une institution éducative postsecondaire encouragerait les gens qui ne s'inscrivent pas présentement à des cours, à poursuivre leur éducation, afin qu'ils deviennent des contribuables à la société ontarienne plutôt que des récipiendaires.

En conclusion, le message principal que je voudrais transmettre : j'espère et je prie que le gouvernement de M. Rae prenne le leadership nécessaire pour assurer la survie du Canada, et un Canada où les anglophones Québécois et les francophones hors Québec peuvent jouir d'une égalité avec tous les Canadiens. En même temps, comme vous l'avez bien vu, j'ai voulu faire un petit «plug» pour le collège du Nord.

1050

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Noël. Il y a des questions. Monsieur Bisson.

M. Bisson : J'ai vraiment deux questions ayant affaire avec la première partie de la présentation que vous avez faite puis la dernière.

La première partie : vous avez fait le commentaire qu'il y a un manque de leadership au fédéral vis-à-vis de la capacité de gérer la situation constitutionnelle. Je ne sais pas si j'ai bien compris, mais je pense que ce que vous avez dit est que l'Ontario, vu le manque de leadership, doit assumer cette position pour assurer la présence d'une voix nationale vis-à-vis de la constitution. N'est-ce pas une situation où possiblement — puis je ne sais pas quelle est mon opinion, d'une manière ou d'une autre, mais je pose la question — si l'Ontario essaie de trop parler pour la nation, qu'il est dans notre intérêt de répondre pour l'Ontario ?

La deuxième a affaire avec la question du collège, mais on va aborder la première, parce que ça va détraquer la question.

M. Noël : Okay. Ma perception est que la vue présentée par le présent gouvernement vise plutôt une délégation de pouvoirs et vise une répartition en onze sections de responsabilités ce qui, nécessairement, va mener à des batailles de clocher, si vous voulez, une mentalité de clocher ; chacun va pour sa part. Le pays devient presque ingouvernable avec onze gouvernements.

Ce que je prévois, ce que je voudrais pour l'Ontario est que l'Ontario prenne un leadership du côté national, bien sûr en protégeant ses intérêts, mais en protégeant ses intérêts dans une enveloppe canadienne et non dans une enveloppe québécoise, une enveloppe ontarienne, manitobaine ou québécoise ce soit. C'est cette vue d'ensemble qui manque. Il faut tous nous rappeler qu'on est Canadien en premier, et je pense que c'est ça qu'il faut repenser. Je me réfère toujours à l'époque de M. Trudeau avec son «un Canada» et c'est cette perception-là qui semble être perdue. C'est certain qu'il faut évolueret tout change, mais dans cette évolution je pense qu'il ne faudrait pas perdre la

vue d'ensemble et la vue d'un Canada. C'est ça qui est important.

M. le Président : Je vais passer à d'autres questions. Mr Offer.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. My question really follows on the previous line of questioning in talking about leadership and the role of Ontario. I am wondering if you might share with us your view of leadership in this matter in this respect. I would like to receive your perspective as to the leadership that Ontario should place should be in the area of actions taken within the province of Ontario as a role for other provinces, as an example for other provinces, in enhancing French-language services in, for instance, a francophone university, as opposed to the role of Ontario vis-à-vis other provinces as a conciliator or a negotiator.

Mr Noël: I think both of those roles should be assumed by Ontario where there is that vacuum or that perceived vacuum. I think it is important not only in the area of bilingualism but in the area of native rights as well. I think those are important too.

I think the role of Ontario in promoting equality and fairness, leading through the example, and the second part of what you are saying, as a negotiator-conciliator is an extremely important role. I think part of the role of the commission, what the commission is doing here, should be broadcast to the other provinces. I know Quebec is doing it, but the other provinces might take a lead from this as well. So I think both of those are extremely important: lead by example and lead by undertaking the conciliation role.

Mr Offer: Thank you.

Mr Harnick: You talked about the idea of official bilingualism. You made no mention in your presentation about Bill 8. What I would like to know is, from your point of view, is Bill 8 working, can Bill 8 be improved and is there something that the government should be doing to make the provisions of Bill 8 more understandable to people generally?

Mr Noël: I am not up to 100% on Bill 8. Maybe some of the people following me will be more up to date. Bill 8 is a step in the right direction. It is a big step in the right direction. Bill 8 is going a long way towards the equality that I am speaking of, in seeking that equality.

There has been a reticence on the part of a lot of French Canadians in seeking French services and coming forward because we are always being a minority and Bill 8 will help these people. It is going to help these people stand up, get educated and become, as I said in my document, real contributors to the Ontario society. I think it is going a long way and it is helping.

Official bilingualism, once Bill 8 is fully established and is working well, can follow. It would be the next logical step and I think if things go well with the implementation, with the educational institutions and with other developments, we could proceed in that direction.

The other thing is that through Bill 8, the gradual approach might help to calm some fears that people might have about what official bilingualism really might mean to Ontario. There is always the fear of the unknown, so giv-

ing a predecessor like that might help calm some of those fears.

Mr Harnick: Can I take it from what you say then that before Ontario, if it ever does, takes the step towards full bilingualism, we should experiment for a while longer under Bill 8 and build towards the day that official bilingualism may be acceptable, as opposed to having a position of official bilingualism right now? That is the tenor of, I think, what you are saying.

Mr Noël: It depends on the time frame that you might be thinking of. There is always the danger that it could be put off and sloughed off and sloughed off.

If we put everything in the context of the constitutional debate that we are looking at, and that type of thing, we might see within a year or a year and a half or so the timing might be better to implement official bilingualism at that time as a signal to the rest of the country, in keeping with what I was presenting there. The timing has to be examined, but you would not want to put it off too long if you want to set the example.

Mr Harnick: Thank you.

1100

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO-NIPISSING

The Chair: I invite next Richard Marleau and Robert Renaud de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario - Nipissing.

M. Marleau : Bonjour, nos amis les députés de l'Ontario, et aussi bienvenue à la Semaine française dans le Nipissing. C'est pour cela que je porte le bouton.

En tant que représentant des francophones de la région de Nipissing, l'ACFO-Nipissing est heureuse d'adresser votre comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Nous sommes un peu ennuyés par le manque de temps donné à la population, et spécialement celle du nord de l'Ontario, à se préparer convenablement pour votre visite. L'ACFO-Nipissing n'a pas eu le privilège de revoir le document de consultation, Changement et renouveau, sur lequel nous aurions aimé offrir une réaction.

Néanmoins, l'ACFO-Nipissing espère que sa réflexion plutôt spontanée et proactive aidera le comité à compléter son mandat.

L'ACFO-Nipissing représente les trois principaux centres urbains, soit North Bay, Sturgeon Falls et Mattawa, ainsi que les petites communautés environnantes qui sont plutôt françaises. Vous pourrez voir dans le tableau à la page suivante de notre document la répartition des groupes de francophones dans notre région. En d'autres mots, nous représentons en moyenne 30% de la population, une minorité, entre guillemets, sensiblement importante.

M. Renaud : Le Canada fait présentement face à une étape délicate et déterminante dans son avenir. Les citoyennes et citoyens ne veulent plus s'en remettre seulement aux chefs politiques pour régler la question. Ils veulent s'en mêler eux-mêmes et elles-mêmes et le font avec enthousiasme au Québec du moins.

Ayant découvert une identité nationale qui leur est propre depuis leur révolution tranquille, les Québécois se sentent capables de prendre leur destinée en main. Ils disent carrément à leurs chefs politiques ce qu'ils attendent d'eux en matière de droits constitutionnels.

De plus, les peuples autochtones, toujours ignorés et pas pris au sérieux, maintenant veulent aussi cette justice et ce respect. Ces peuples qui habitaient ce territoire avant nous le méritent bien.

Pour garder un Canada uni, il faudra des changements majeurs d'attitudes les uns envers les autres. Il faudra se débarrasser de nos préjugés et de notre soif de dominer les autres communautés. Il faudra maintenant penser en termes de partenaires égaux et non en termes de groupes majoritaires et de groupes minoritaires, tels qu'utilisés présentement.

Le concept d'égalité doit primer dans toutes les régions du Canada et non seulement si le nombre le justifie. Alors, la constitution doit reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les autochtones, les francophones et les anglophones. La constitution doit également reconnaître l'apport des générations successives de néo-Canadiennes et de néo-Canadiens.

Les droits linguistiques des communautés francophones et autochtones doivent être assurés d'un statut, d'institutions et de services égaux à ceux des anglophones d'un bout à l'autre du pays.

Le transfert du pouvoir du gouvernement fédéral aux provinces et aux territoires est maintenant inévitable après la faillite de l'accord du Lac Meech.

Le fait de reconnaître le Québec comme une société distincte n'enlève rien aux autres provinces et territoires.

Les communautés autochtones constituent des sociétés distinctes et doivent jouir d'un degré d'autonomie leur permettant de se gérer actuellement et de déterminer leur avenir.

M. Marleau : Avant 1986, les chefs politiques ontariens et ontariennes ont signalé officiellement l'importance de la communauté francophone dans le développement de cette province, un rôle qui remonte à un peu plus de trois siècles. Depuis, la province a adopté la Loi de 1986 sur les services en français en Ontario. Dans notre mémoire nous citons son préambule. À noter spécifiquement dans le préambule est la volonté exprimée par l'Ontario qui désire sauvegarder la langue française pour les générations à venir. L'ACFO-Nipissing reconnaît les efforts que le gouvernement de l'Ontario a investis pour les francophones d'ici pour qu'ils se sentent participants et participantes au dynamisme de cette province. Aujourd'hui, ces efforts doivent être poursuivis et intensifiés au plus vite. Notre province doit exercer un véritable leadership auprès de la population anglophone du Canada. Étant au centre du pays et ayant la plus grande population francophone hors Québec, l'Ontario doit donner l'exemple aux autres provinces avec des actes clairs et concrets afin de démontrer que les communautés francophones et autochtones sont de véritables partenaires égaux au Canada.

Il est essentiel que la province de l'Ontario se déclare officiellement bilingue, comme l'a fait le Nouveau-Brun-

wick en 1982. Il faut aussi qu'elle tienne compte des droits, des intérêts, des besoins de la communauté autochtone.

Il est essentiel que la province de l'Ontario respecte le droit à l'éducation des francophones et des autochtones dans leur langue maternelle respective dès l'âge de trois ans jusqu'au postsecondaire, incluant la garderie, l'alphabetisation et la formation professionnelle. Toute institution découlant de ce droit doit être gérée par chacune des trois communautés nationales.

Il est essentiel que la province de l'Ontario reconnaisse l'égalité des chances des trois communautés nationales en plus de leur droit au bien-être et à une vie de qualité. Les services publics doivent donc être assurés dans la langue officielle de son choix. Sans restreindre la généralité de ce qui précède, les francophones ont besoin, en plus de services scolaires, des services dans les secteurs suivants : juridique, services sociaux et communautaires, santé, culture, communication, services municipaux.

Il est essentiel que la province de l'Ontario donne aux trois communautés nationales le pouvoir de gérer les structures politiques et administratives des services pertinents à leur épanouissement. Dans ce but, il faut assurer à long terme aux communautés nationales un financement équitable de leurs institutions.

En outre, l'administration publique de l'Ontario doit impliquer davantage ces régions dans l'élaboration de ses politiques sociales, économiques et culturelles.

Pour l'Ontario, il s'agit d'un test ultime : prendre courageusement l'orientation d'un véritable partage avec les trois communautés nationales.

M. Renaud : Pour ce qui en est de la région du Nipissing, les francophones du Nipissing ont les mêmes aspirations sociales et économiques que les autres francophones de la province. Faisant partie d'une des trois communautés nationales, ils veulent leurs établissements et des services pertinents à leur épanouissement. La programmation pour l'année 1991-92 de l'ACFO-Nipissing souligne prioritairement les aspirations et les intérêts des francophones de cette région.

Dans le domaine de l'éducation, on travaille à obtenir un ou des campus d'un collège français dans le nord de l'Ontario, à obtenir un ou deux conseils scolaires de langue française et à augmenter les services d'alphabetisation en français.

En santé et en services sociaux : établir deux centres médico-sociaux de langue française et augmenter le nombre de places dans nos garderies françaises.

En communication : établir un journal hebdomadaire français et établir d'autres réseaux d'informations, telle une radio communautaire française, dans le but de rapprocher nos sous-régions.

En politique : assurer des représentants et des représentantes francophones aux différents paliers gouvernementaux — fédéral, provincial et municipal.

M. Marleau : En conclusion, il faut que les anglophones cessent de penser que le Canada leur appartient à eux tout seuls. Les francophones et les autochtones sont aussi des partenaires égaux. Seuls le respect et la valorisa-

tion de la langue et de la culture de chacune des trois communautés nationales assureront l'unité du Canada.

Il faut que l'Ontario intensifie ses efforts déjà amorcés envers les francophones en proclamant la province officiellement bilingue. Ainsi, elle assurera le leadership nécessaire pour créer l'unité nationale. La province doit aussi prendre tous les moyens possibles pour réduire l'assimilation des francophones. De plus, un effort semblable doit s'ajouter pour les communautés autochtones.

Comme exemple, la situation actuelle du Nipissing-Ouest démontre bien où les trois communautés nationales travaillent à devenir des partenaires égaux dans certains secteurs. Dans cette sous-région où les francophones sont majoritaires et les anglophones minoritaires, tous deux jouissent de plusieurs services offerts dans leur langue respective.

1110

M. le Président : Il y a des questions. On a un peu de temps pour ça. Ms Churley to begin.

Ms Churley : Thank you for your presentation. I am hearing myself in French here in my ear. It was very enlightening and I think the people from these towns are very lucky to have you representing them. My question is, a few times in the past a couple of people have brought up various scenarios of what it might mean to francophones in Ontario if Quebec were to separate from Canada and I am wondering if you have any comments on that in terms of the hard fight you have had over the years to ensure more rights for francophones, if you think having Quebec as part of the country is helpful to you in terms of making sure that that pressure continues to be there or if there are fears that if Quebec were to leave it would make it harder for the minority of francophones in Ontario to fight for their rights.

M. Marleau : Une bonne question. Il faut que je sois honnête pour dire que oui, il y a peut-être des peurs qui existent parmi la francophonie de l'Ontario. Mais je ne pense pas qu'on soit Québécois, nous sommes des Franco-Ontariens. La Loi 8 n'a pas été mise en place pour plaire au Québec, j'en suis certain, et je ne crois pas que le Québec se sépare.

Ms Churley : That is a very positive approach. Thank you.

The Chair : Okay. Mr Harris.

Mr Harris : Richard, I appreciate much of your presentation is around the need for services in Ontario up to official bilingualism. I do not want to get into that debate. Official bilingualism seems to mean different things to different people and very often the arguments are not on the same playing field. What I want to do, though, is suggest to you that, as you have indicated, Bill 8 really is not of much significance, whether Quebec is satisfied that its demands are met, and while I understand where you are coming from and am supportive of some of your goals, you know, not quite all, you seem to be suggesting that if Ontario does all of these things and declares itself officially bilingual and the rest of it, this somehow is going to help keep the country together. Quite frankly, I agree with your assessment on Bill 8. I do not think it means boo as

far as Quebec is concerned, nor do I think Ontario declaring itself officially bilingual will mean boo in helping Mr Rae and the Ontario government in negotiating with Quebec.

The reality of the situation and where I would like your input is in some of the significant issues that will be faced in dealing with Quebec, have been faced over the last 20 years and still have not been resolved. One of the aspects of Quebec's Bélanger paper suggests and just comes right out and says language should be a provincial responsibility. This would resolve this whole aspect in Quebec's eyes. Marcel indicated he does not see the Trudeau vision any more in Canada. I suggest to you that Quebec has consistently, repeatedly, unequivocally rejected the Trudeau vision and refused to sign that vision and Quebec continues to refuse that. Meech Lake refused to acknowledge that and I see no sign that is an option on the table, at least as far as Quebec is concerned. It strikes me that having language as a provincial responsibility allows all provinces to be equal in this respect of federal-provincial powers. I am interested in your reaction to that.

M. Marleau : Bonne question, Monsieur Harris. Ma réaction est que si la province avait fait des actes clairs et concrets pour reconnaître les trois communautés nationales, peut-être que les Québécois auraient considéré leur position. Dire que le Québec veut la juridiction sur la langue, je comprends très bien. Dire aussi que les Québécois ne font pas partie de la vision de Trudeau est un peu exagéré, parce que s'il y avait une province qui devrait être considérée bilingue, c'est bien le Québec où il y a au-dessus de 40% de Québécois qui parlent anglais. Alors, j'ai des difficultés à dire que les Québécois n'ont jamais adopté la vision de Trudeau. Je pense qu'ils sont allés loin et puis on mélange la bataille politique de centralisation et décentralisation avec celle de la langue. Il faut faire attention. J'espère que ça répond.

M. Beer : Ma question se porte aussi à la Loi 8 et aux deux perspectives. Je pense que ça peut être utile pour nous si vous pouvez nous dire ce que vous pensez maintenant, un an et demi après la mise en vigueur de la Loi 8. Quels changements est-ce que ça fait dans la région de Nipissing ? Jusqu'à un certain point vous avez souligné quelques lacunes dans votre présentation, mais qu'est-ce que ça veut dire pour les francophones de cette région ?

Deuxièmement, comme vous le savez sans doute, il y a chez les anglophones ceux qui nous disent que maintenant il faut être bilingue pour n'importe quel poste du gouvernement, et ça veut dire en effet que seulement les francophones peuvent avoir ces postes. Hier on a reçu quelques présentations de cet avis. Ma question est : que pensez-vous que le gouvernement devrait faire ? En tant qu'ancien ministre délégué aux Affaires francophones, c'est une question qui m'occupait l'année passée et qui m'occupe encore cette année, pour assurer que tout le monde accepte pas simplement le principe de la Loi 8, mais en effet que la mise en vigueur se fasse de façon équitable. Qu'est-ce que, disons les francophones, le gouvernement pourraient faire ou devraient faire avec la communauté anglophone pour

mieux faire accepter cette Loi selon vous ? Donc, deux questions des deux perspectives.

M. Marleau : Monsieur Beer, je crois que la Loi 8 est un avantage pour les francophones et je crois aussi que les anglophones comprennent peut-être mieux, avec la Loi 8, certains services qui sont essentiels pour la population francophone. Les discuter avec la Loi 8 en ce moment c'est que la mise en oeuvre est en échelon, donc si on regarde certains ministères, si on regarde le ministère des Services sociaux et communautaires dans notre région, on y va à petits pas, on regarde quelque chose qui va être quatre, cinq ans, dépendant des agences impliquées. Pour nous c'est difficile, parce qu'il y a des services essentiels qui devraient être en place ; ça c'est un problème.

Par contre, pour adresser l'autre question, comment est-ce que les anglophones vont réagir face à une province qui est vraiment bilingue, et je pense que finalement la question va jusque-là, c'est que, si on regarde dans le district de Nipissing, si on regarde les écoles dans la ville de North Bay, le taux très élevé d'élèves qui s'inscrivent à l'immersion démontre que la population anglophone est très ouverte à avoir une province bilingue. Si on regarde dans la section anglaise du conseil des écoles séparées, plus de 70% des élèves qui s'inscrivent en maternelle s'inscrivent dans le programme d'immersion. Et du côté public, je ne sais pas exactement le pourcentage mais il est très élevé. Donc, ça veut dire qu'il y a une éducation qui était faite. Les gens sont de plus en plus sensibilisés aux besoins.

Je crois que les propos de certains groupes que vous avez entendus hier à Sudbury, que seulement des gens bilingues ont des postes, il faudrait questionner, à savoir si peut-être les parents veulent que leurs enfants soient bilingues, non seulement pour avoir le poste mais pour être bilingues, pour avoir une meilleure compréhension et appréciation de nos cultures. Parce qu'ici dans le Nipissing, on voit de plus en plus un taux élevé de familles qui vont inscrire leurs enfants dans des cours d'immersion.

M. Winninger : Concernant les services que vous voudriez offrir en français, comme des centres médico-sociaux ou plus de places dans les garderies françaises, je me demande si ces services seront dans les secteurs privé ou public.

1120

M. Renaud : Présentement, l'ACFO se penche dans son comité de services sociaux, communautaires et santé à certaines demandes auprès du ministère pour deux centres médico-sociaux. Ce n'est pas dans le sens privé, c'est la formule qui est utilisée à travers la province si on regarde les centres à Toronto pour la population francophone. Pour ce qui en est de la garderie, avec la Garderie Soleil ici qui vient de recevoir des fonds et dont la construction doit débuter à l'automne, il y aura peut-être 100 places pour des élèves francophones. Là encore c'est les parents qui devront payer pour utiliser le service. Certaines places seront probablement octroyées par le ministère.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Actually I had a very similar question to the one that has just been placed. I want to, first of all, thank you for your brief. I am very happy that you gave

the breakdown of the region, which is helpful to us, and your very practical solutions and, as you have answered the questions putting them into a much broader perspective, it has been very helpful for us.

I want to ask you a little bit about the day care, if you could just expound a little bit more on that. As you know, we did do a major study last year in the Legislature about this type of service and the francophones certainly made a very, very good case. Can you tell me, do you have some francophone day care centres here now and are they attached to the schools, or who is operating them basically?

M Renaud : Présentement, dans la région nous avons une garderie ici à North Bay, la Garderie Soleil, qui est sous les auspices des Compagnons des Francs Loisirs. Eux ont un projet de construction qui débutera à l'automne. Ce sera la plus grande garderie francophone ou anglophone, je pense, dans la province de l'Ontario. Aussi à Sturgeon Falls il y a eu dernièrement des places réservées dans une garderie ; il y avait deux soumissions je crois pour Sturgeon Falls, où il y a présentement 24 places pour les francophones et il y en aura davantage.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Merci. I wish you well with the effort because I think this is where it all begins, in your day care facilities, as in ours.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Marleau et Monsieur Renaud.

Could I call next Lana Mitchell from the group Low Income People Involvement of Nipissing. Okay, we will try later.

ANDRÉ LACOSTE

The Chair: André Lacoste.

M. Lacoste : Distingués membres de la commission — j'allais même dire distingués membres fatigués et très patients de la commission — je suis heureux de vivre dans cette magnifique démocratie qui me permet de me sentir chez moi et de m'exprimer librement dans la langue de mon choix sur une question aussi importante. Je parle en mon nom. Je suis retraité, même si j'enseigne presque à plein temps à l'université du Nipissing, et du français à des anglophones, s'il vous plaît.

Je voudrais commencer ma présentation par une question. L'Ontario a-t-il un rôle à jouer dans la redéfinition du pacte confédératif, redéfinition qui apparaît comme une évidence inéluctable à l'horizon ? De cette question je tire deux corollaires. Le premier : il est sûr et certain que selon toutes les tendances politiques en jeu, le vieux pacte confédératif agonise. On peut vouloir rêver en couleurs, faire l'autruche ou se faire croire que tout est parfait comme dans les meilleurs des mondes, que nous pouvons continuer à sommeiller, que le cauchemar va s'en aller, qu'un quelconque sauveur va tout régler et tout remettre dans le bel univers ordonné aux couleurs uniformes, aux idées bien contrôlées, aux ensembles bien unis. Tel n'est pas le cas. Nous ne pouvons nous dire : « Dormons et oublions, tout n'est qu'un mauvais rêve ». Nous nous préparons ainsi à un réveil douloureux.

Le second corollaire : puisqu'il est évident que quelque chose doit être fait, est-ce que l'Ontario a un rôle à jouer

dans cette redéfinition ? Au premier corollaire je ne répondrai pas davantage, puisqu'à mon avis il faut être drôlement borné pour ne pas voir le problème et les conséquences qui ne manqueront pas de suivre si on ne trouve pas de solutions adéquates, et vite.

C'est donc sur des réponses au deuxième corollaire que se concentrera mon mémoire. Et je commence en disant que l'Ontario a certainement un rôle à jouer dans la recherche d'une nouvelle entente constitutionnelle. Pourquoi ? Je vais vous donner quelques raisons. D'abord, parce que c'est une place qui lui revient tout naturellement, une place que tous ses partenaires s'attendent à le voir occuper, et voici pourquoi.

D'abord, la situation démographique qu'occupe l'Ontario dans le pays lui donne un droit tacite d'exprimer ses idées dans les domaines qui, sans être nécessairement de sa compétence directe, le deviennent indirectement parce qu'ils affectent une très grande partie de la population canadienne, celle de l'Ontario.

La situation économique du Canada —

M. le Président : Il y a un problème avec la traduction.

Ça va ? Are we getting the translation now? Okay.

M. Lacoste : D'accord, donc je reprends ?

M. le Président : Oui, oui, si vous voulez ne pas recommencer, mais aller un peu —

M. Lacoste : D'accord. C'est donc sur des réponses au deuxième corollaire que se concentrera mon mémoire. Comme j'ai dit, l'Ontario a certainement un rôle à jouer dans la recherche de nouvelles ententes constitutionnelles. Pourquoi ? Parce que c'est une place qui lui revient tout naturellement, une place que tous ses partenaires s'attendent à le voir occuper.

M. le Président : Attendez une seconde. We are just waiting to get a signal. Could someone give me a signal when we are okay? All right.

M. Lacoste : Okay, on reprend. I would try in English, but I am not too sure about that. Pour la troisième fois — j'ai l'impression de me répéter. Je vais mettre la même émotion. The show must go on. C'est donc sur des réponses au deuxième corollaire que se concentrera mon mémoire.

L'Ontario a certainement un rôle à jouer dans la recherche d'une nouvelle entente constitutionnelle. Pourquoi ? Parce que c'est une place qui lui revient tout naturellement, une place que tous ses partenaires s'attendent à le voir occuper, et voici pourquoi.

D'abord, la situation démographique qu'occupe l'Ontario dans le pays lui donne un droit tacite d'exprimer ses idées dans les domaines qui, sans être nécessairement de sa compétence directe, le deviennent indirectement parce qu'ils affectent une très grande partie de la population canadienne, c'est-à-dire celle de l'Ontario.

Deuxièmement, la situation économique du Canada ne peut oublier cette entité qui constitue l'une des roues motrices dans tout le système économique du pays. Comment l'Ontario pourrait-il être ignoré par tout ce qui touche l'économie de l'ensemble sans se sentir obligé de faire entendre sa voix ?

1130

Troisièmement, la position stratégique de l'Ontario le situe au coeur même de cet immense territoire. La province est dotée d'un ensemble de richesses naturelles qui en font la province la mieux nantie du pays, la plaque tournante de toutes les communications, tant est-ouest que nord-sud. On ne peut songer à une redéfinition de cet ensemble qu'on appelle le Canada sans compter sur ce pivot que constitue l'Ontario. C'est pour cela que l'Ontario a quelque chose à dire dans la démarche. Et à ceux tantôt qui se posaient une question, à savoir pourquoi l'Ontario devrait jouer un rôle, j'essaie d'y répondre ici.

Quatrième raison pour laquelle l'Ontario doit jouer un rôle important : la place historique qu'occupe l'Ontario dans notre pays lui confère aussi des droits et par déduction, des devoirs face à ce qui se passe dans notre pays. L'Ontario, avec le Québec, a été le berceau de ce pays. Il a été le tremplin duquel les découvreurs se sont élancés vers la découverte du Nord et de l'Ouest. L'Ontario a été aussi la barricade infranchissable, ne l'oublions pas, qui a empêché le Canada de devenir autre chose et sans doute de ne pas exister comme entité propre à lui. Cela aussi confère à l'Ontario un droit de parole et un droit d'action.

Quelle est la nature du rôle à jouer alors ? L'Ontario, à cause des énoncés précédents, devrait jouer un rôle prépondérant dans l'effort déployé par tous les partenaires pour sauver notre pays. On s'attend de notre province rien de moins qu'un leadership fort, engagé, éclairé, taillé à sa mesure.

Il est évident qu'il doit se présenter comme un modèle à suivre pour le reste des provinces. Ce doit être un rôle tout empreint de «fair play» et de largeur de vue. Ce doit être un rôle qui s'affirme et au besoin s'impose malgré la courte vue des éléments qui voudraient l'empêcher de s'exprimer fortement.

Quels sont les domaines où l'Ontario doit marquer des points, et dès maintenant ? Ce sont ceux où la controverse est la plus virulente, là où il faut désamorcer des enjeux, là même où on puise les plus grandes sources de désaccord, c'est-à-dire, et si on va au fond des choses, c'est le respect des différences.

On l'a vu : dès les premières audiences que vous avez tenues, trop d'intervenants ont laissé couler le fiel d'une haine mal contenue plutôt que d'apporter des arguments sensés, pesés et objectifs. Encore trop de nos concitoyens, malheureusement, s'en prennent à ce qui fait la différence de notre peuple, les ethnies et les cultures diversifiées. On en veut aux francophones d'être francophones, aux autochtones d'être autochtones et bientôt aux minorités visibles d'être ce qu'elles sont, visibles, donc dérangeantes.

Une trop grande partie de notre population ne se sent pas encore assez canadienne pour ne pas se sentir menacée par la différence qui fait la grandeur, par la richesse de la palette culturelle qui fait la magnificence du tableau. Au contraire, on se cantonne dans des positions périmées qui pourraient beaucoup plus ressembler à l'Afrique du Sud, à la Russie et ses États balkaniques qu'à un pays qui a toujours voulu donner l'image de l'ouverture d'esprit.

Dans un dialogue comme celui que nous avons, que vous avez surtout et que le gouvernement s'est permis

d'avoir, quelles voix faut-il écouter ? Dans tous ces débats, l'Ontario, qui prête l'oreille à ses citoyens afin d'orienter son action, se doit d'entendre tous ceux qui veulent bien s'exprimer. Mais quelles voix doit-il écouter ? Ce sont les voix de la tolérance, celles qui savent distinguer entre les peurs factices et les réalités enrichissantes, celles qui permettent de partager avec l'autre, d'ouvrir leur cœur et leur esprit aux différences sans pour autant se sentir tout menacées.

On doit écouter les voix de la raison, celles qui savent mettre de côté les peurs irréflechies, les sophismes trompeurs, les «on dit» et les suppositions, les généralisations qui appliquent à tout un groupe les défauts des exceptions, ces voix calmes et lucides qui savent répondre par des solutions constructives plutôt que d'attiser le feu de la discorde.

Quelles voix écouter ? Les voix qui véhiculent l'exemple d'ailleurs, celles qui nous montrent le succès des pays qui ont su faire de la diversité de leurs cultures et des langues de leurs habitants une richesse qui fait l'envie de leurs voisins. Regardez l'Europe en particulier. À part les Américains, sauf le respect que je leur dois, quels sont les pays à forte teneur éducative à se contenter encore de se cantonner dans la connaissance d'une seule langue ?

Il ne faut surtout pas oublier dans tout ce débat la voix la plus importante, celle qui véhicule vraiment l'avenir de notre province, de notre pays, la voix des jeunes. Eux savent bien mieux que nous ce que veut dire le «village global», l'échange international, l'effet des déchirures du tissu culturel global, et si nous ne savons pas interpréter adéquatement les messages qu'ils n'ont pas toujours la chance de nous transmettre publiquement, comme c'est le cas présentement, ils s'empresseront aussitôt qu'ils le pourront, dans quelques années, ce ne sera pas long, de nous reléguer aux oubliettes ou aux musées comme on le fait des dinosaures.

Dans le dialogue, quelles voix faut-il ignorer ? On écoute tout le monde, on entend tout le monde. Qui sont ceux qu'on doit ignorer ? Peut-on se permettre d'ignorer quelqu'un dans ce débat démocratique ? Ma réponse est oui, si on ne peut leur faire entendre raison. Les voici : les prêcheurs de discorde, sous leur couvert de la connaissance infuse, au nom des droits qui sont les leurs, en ignorant les droits des autres. Qui faut-il ignorer ? Les semeurs d'erreurs, ceux dont le jeu consiste à utiliser les faussetés érigées en système, les demi-vérités, les mensonges, surtout quand ils s'adressent à des auditoires non informés et susceptibles de les croire à cause du rôle que ces menteurs jouent quelquefois dans la société. Ce sont de faux prophètes qui tirent leur satisfaction dans la discorde.

Qui faut-il oublier ? Les retranchés dans des positions qu'ils considèrent confortables sans jamais se rendre compte que ces mêmes positions sont périmées, désuètes, dépassées par le temps et les événements. Ce sont ceux qu'on qualifie souvent de dinosaures dans notre société et qui déplaisent tant aux jeunes qui veulent bâtir une société nouvelle.

Qui faut-il oublier dans ce débat ? Les opposants chroniques à tout changement. Ce sont les insécures, qui voient comme une menace à leur bien-être tout changement à leur

modus vivendi et qui se barricadent derrière des similiréglements du type : «Cette ville se déclare unilingue», les radicaux, ceux qui sont prêts à tout casser, à jeter par dessus bord des valeurs qui ont fait l'orgueil de nos pères. «On va leur montrer. Casser tout, et puis après on verra bien ce qui va arriver». Ce sont des gens qui ne mesurent pas la portée de leurs gestes, des irresponsables qui, finalement, démolissent tout sans jamais rien construire.

Qui, à part ça, faut-il oublier ? Les assoiffés de pouvoir, ceux qui ne calculent que le nombre de votes qui leur permettra d'avoir leur nom en grosses lettres dans le petit journal local. Ceux qui rêvent de pouvoir décider pour les autres, de leurs biens, de leurs droits, de leur liberté. L'ostacisme n'est pas loin du pouvoir absolu et on sait que certains individus, comme certains groupes, se croient nés avec le pouvoir absolu. Ce sont les voix les plus dangereuses, celles qui se croient élues pour décider du sort des autres, même à leur détriment, sous leur couvert de la démocratie.

1140

En conclusion, l'Ontario a une chance unique de se positionner avantageusement dans le débat historique de l'avenir de notre pays. Il peut, par son exemple, couper court aux arguments les plus employés par ceux qui veulent briser l'unité de notre pays, à savoir, quels sont ces arguments ? Le rejet de la différence, la négation au droit de l'autre à être ce qu'il est dans la justice et la dignité, l'égalité de tous devant tous et partout. C'est ça qu'on nous dit quand on veut se séparer. On n'entend pas ça.

Si l'Ontario, dans le courage de ses convictions, déclare solennellement qu'il respecte la dualité linguistique des peuples fondateurs au point d'en faire un état de fait provincial ; s'il se dit capable de dialoguer avec les peuples autochtones et de rendre justice où justice doit être rendue ; s'il est prêt à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour assurer que partout tous et chacun puisse se sentir chez lui sans se faire dire qu'il n'a pas d'affaires là, parce qu'il est visible, qu'il parle français ou ne fait pas partie de la race dominante, alors l'Ontario sera la grand Ontario dont les jeunes générations d'aujourd'hui pourront porter fièrement les couleurs.

Est-ce que dans l'avenir ceux qui grandissent, nos jeunes d'aujourd'hui, ceux de la maternelle, pourront vivre avec ce que nous aurons contribué à créer maintenant ou devront-ils, dans quelques années, réouvrir portes et fenêtres de cette maison que nous leur aurons léguée et dans laquelle, de nouveau, ils se sentiront étouffés ? Pensez-y bien.

Mr Martin: You raise some very interesting questions and I think some very important questions in front of the process we are entering into here, the question of who we include and who we exclude. It causes me concern, but not a huge concern, when we talk about who we include, because I am always of the opinion that we include as many as we can and those who want to participate.

But there are many out there in our communities who want to participate who are being excluded, perhaps because they feel uncomfortable with the position they find themselves in, because of circumstances they see being

beyond their control. So when they speak they do not speak perhaps so eloquently or in such an organized fashion as those who have thought about this for a long time. And they get labelled, and I think we have to be really careful about labels, like dinosaurs and that kind of thing, because there are very good people out there who have some real concerns about where this province is going re its position in front of the language question, the native question, and they are all very important questions.

However, they have to be listened to as well. Maybe it is not so much what they are saying that we should be listening to as who they are. They are people; the hurt that what they are saying is coming out of. If we can go beyond some of the barriers and limitations which, when we talk to people, we set up for ourselves, to listen more deeply to the soul, we might hear even from the anglophones who at this point come across as perhaps bigoted or somehow anti-everything, that they really do have a concern that is real. They are speaking out of their hurt and their fear—maybe in some instances their ignorance—more than actually being against anything. Could you comment a little further? That really concerns me.

M. Lacoste : Je peux vous répondre en français ?

M. Martin : Oui.

M. Lacoste : Loin de moi l'idée, d'abord, de caractériser ou de catégoriser certains groupes de personnes. Il ne faut pas écouter la voix de ceux qui prêtent à un groupe total les défauts de quelques-uns. C'est ce que je veux dire par là. Loin de moi l'idée de prétendre que tout un groupe de notre société, sous prétexte qu'un ou deux de leurs membres se sont exprimés d'une façon absolue et virulente, représente l'ensemble, loin de là. Au contraire, même, je pense que je l'ai dit. Il faut ignorer la voix, et quand je parle de la voix je ne parle pas de groupes, mais je parle d'individus qui veulent bâtir sur un état actuel des choses, une puissance, disons un avenir personnel. Il faut dépasser ces voix que j'ai dit de ne pas écouter et aller plus loin et voir le problème, ne pas se laisser tromper par les trompeurs, ne pas se laisser embarquer par les radicaux.

Mais ce sont toujours des exceptions. Ce ne sont jamais des groupes en entier, même quand vous entendez quelqu'un parler «au nom de». Rarement les personnes qui parlent «au nom de» sont-elles des personnes informées. Ah, il y a bien ceux qui sont des semeurs d'erreurs, qui en profitent pour semer des idées alors que l'auditoire n'a aucune façon de se renseigner. Mais je ne veux exclure, loin de là, je ne veux exclure personne dans le dialogue. Je vais exclure ceux qui ne veulent pas être inclus dans le dialogue, c'est-à-dire ceux qui veulent tout casser, ceux qui mentent, ceux qui se bâtissent du capital politique, ceux qui veulent profiter de la situation et non pas qui veulent profiter à l'ensemble. C'est ça mon idée. J'espère que mon message est passé de cette façon-là.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation, with the eloquence and passion with which you spoke about tolerance and understanding of differences, and how our strength is in understanding those differences.

Your presentation was very much contained within Ontario. It was characterized, if I may, by one of your first

statements, that Ontario has a unique opportunity; what followed from that was how Ontario's unique opportunity would be within the province of Ontario—and well said, in that respect.

However, there is a great deal of activity going on outside of Ontario, not only within Quebec but all provinces. With respect to Quebec, however, you are, I know, well aware of the activities which are now going on, and I am wondering if you might share with us the unique opportunity Ontario would have, not only in activities within the province of Ontario but, indeed, with respect to the activities which are going outside of Ontario. As there seems to be a move away from the status quo towards a distancing of the provincial powers in Quebec from the federal government, do you feel that that distancing of Quebec from the rest of the country in any way may threaten the strength of our country being tolerant and understanding for a diversity of individuals?

M. Lacoste : D'abord, il est évident que l'Ontario n'est qu'un partenaire. L'Ontario n'est pas l'ensemble du Canada, même si on aime dire que ce qui est bon pour l'Ontario est bon pour le Canada, et ce qui est bon pour le Canada est bon pour l'Ontario. C'est clair aussi que l'Ontario seul ne peut pas empêcher une catastrophe de se produire si la catastrophe doit se produire. Ce que j'aime dire, peu importe le tournant de l'histoire, au moins l'Ontario, à la suite de ce tournant, peut se dire : «J'ai assumé pleinement le rôle qui me revenait, d'essayer de faire de ce pays un meilleur pays», primo.

Deuxièmement, que la province de Québec se sépare. Comment l'Ontario va-t-il se situer face à l'ensemble, c'est d'histoire, ça c'est difficile à dire. Mais au moins encore une fois, l'Ontario pourra prendre le leadership de la reconstruction de ce que j'appelle cette partie de la division, et on aura sans doute confiance parce qu'on pourra dire : «Au moment où il était le temps de sauver l'ensemble, l'Ontario s'est manifesté comme leader. On devrait être encore capable de se fier à l'Ontario pour rebâtir». Ce que j'espère, c'est que le Canada vient à bout de négocier une certaine entente, une certaine constitution où tous les partenaires actuels se retrouveront. À ce moment-là, et c'est là l'important, on sait que l'Ontario et le Québec — toutes les statistiques économiques le disent — ce sont d'énormes partenaires ; on les appelle les frères siamois. Le seul problème est où les couper, comment les séparer, parce que les deux économies sont absolument en interaction. Alors, que le Québec se sépare ou ne se sépare pas, les gestes que l'Ontario aura posés maintenant viendront éclairer et diriger les gestes qui se poseront demain, soit par une meilleure entente, une meilleure collaboration, soit par un meilleur partenariat, soit certainement par une meilleure confiance mutuelle. Et on a plus de chance comme ça de survivre, même séparés, qu'autrement.

1150

LOW INCOME PEOPLE INVOLVEMENT OF NIPISSING

The Chair: Could I call next Lana Mitchell from the group Low Income People Involvement of Nipissing?

Ms Mitchell: The first thing I would like to do is apologize that I do not have enough copies to distribute to

everyone, but I left a copy with one of the organizers and she will be seeing that it goes around to everyone.

The Chair: That is fine. We can get them done.

Ms Mitchell: The main thing I would like to do is to make sure that when we look at everything involved in looking at Confederation, I think it is extremely important that all points of view are out on the table and are discussed and come out openly. I would like to address you on the concerns and issues I deal with on a day-to-day basis that affect myself, my family and my friends.

Just to give you an idea, LIPI, Low Income People Involvement of Nipissing, is a non-profit organization. We have been in operation officially since 1985. We are a consumer organization mandated to be both responsive and proactive around all issues of poverty and its symptoms and the roots that create poverty and allow it to exist in our country. We are constantly forced to function both in the role of advocate and information broker, as we see these are two things that are not enshrined as being accessible to all people.

That is one of our main focuses for this presentation, that information has to be made available to all people in an equal and accessible form. The follow-up to ensure that rights and full sharing of knowledge and entitlement is also a constant demand dealt with in our organization. These services relate—and, to me, in a very disgusting manner—to the fact that we constantly have to react to people who are denied rights that are already legislated. This has nothing to do with rights that are not legislated, that are not supposed to be equally allocated to people already; these are things that are already within our system that people cannot access.

People walk out of various social service agencies, whether it be provincially under the FBA or municipally under the general welfare assistance program, walk a block and a half over to our office, we make a phone call and all of a sudden their criteria or eligibility has changed. It has not changed; it is just that they know now that there is more than one person who is going to stand up for the rights of that individual. I think that is an appalling situation we have let ourselves reach, and something has to be done about that.

In the discussion paper that was released by the provincial government, which I got on Friday when I was out of town, which is part of my reason for being a little late today—I am going to blame it on the provincial government; I think that is fair—we have to look at the social and economic interests and aspirations as they relate to all the people of Ontario, but I do not think we can realistically do that until we make those social and economic interests available to all people. You cannot aspire to something you know nothing about, or have never had access to or an avenue to explore. The right to maintain dignity, the right to self-development, the opportunity to achieve: these things should be fundamental and they should not be denied or discouraged in anyone in any way, shape or form.

In the city of North Bay, as of December we have 280 families and 233 single individuals on our local housing authority waiting list for rent-geared-to-income housing.

This is a really underrepresented number, because most people see the numbers on the waiting list and do not even bother to apply. Yet we are supposed to be enshrining in our Charter of Rights and Freedoms full access to all people to be able to function in our communities and society as a whole. These things do not exist and we know they do not exist, yet we do not seem to be moving in any way, concretely or appropriately, to be able to work within those numbers.

The number of people involved with social assistance is rising at an alarming rate within the province. At the end of December, if you look at the total population of Ontario and relate it just to the two main programs under social assistance—FBA, delivered provincially, and general welfare assistance, which is delivered municipally mainly—28.99% of the population was on social assistance; this relates to adults, children and beneficiaries.

When I look at that number, it makes me wonder why we have waited this long and have let it reach this state before we have realized that there are roots to these things. It is not that people are lazy or people do not want to work. There is no work, and there is no infrastructure for people to be able to respond to even if they get it. We have a vast number of sole-support parents who cannot access child care whether they can afford to pay for it or not.

This is not guaranteeing rights or freedoms. This is just keeping people within class structures, which we try, for the sake of our consciences, to let on do not exist. It is time we woke up to this reality. Not that I think any of us have to wake up to it: it is time we admit it publicly and do something about it and take it seriously.

Our kids are streamlined in the education system. They do not have the same opportunities presented to them. They have a label attached to them, whether it be developmentally delayed, behaviour modification that is necessary. The things that are labelled on our children because we live in a public housing complex are deplorable. We are all worried about intergenerational poverty, yet we seem to do everything we can legislatively and as a society as a whole to promote it and keep it from changing.

If we look at the unemployment rates, in the two regions immediately closest to North Bay, we have rates for the northern Ontario region of 13% and 12.1% for the Algonquin region. Then we wonder why our numbers on social assistance are rising. We portray things in the media and give releases that show our municipalities struggling with the increase on social assistance rates, and then people blame everything going wrong in this country on the poor, the people who have no control over what goes on in this country to begin with. It is a way of people dealing with their consciences, because they cannot respond or react in a way to meet these needs. We have to look at a country that looks at full employment as a plan, not seeing as an economic stabilizer that unemployment is a good thing.

If unemployment is a good thing, that is fine. Then we had better take a realistic approach and be honest about it and stop whining and complaining every time there is a raise in social assistance case load. Because we are pro-

moting it and, obviously, we must think that is acceptable and comfortable to promote.

If we look at statistics from the North Bay housing depot, a program that offers generic service to all income levels of people in need of adequate, secure and affordable housing, in the month of January alone in a city the size of North Bay we had a client intake of 701 people. This number represents 581 new clients, and these are not all people who are low income. These are people who cannot find accessible, affordable housing anywhere in the community: 581 were new clients and 120 were repeat clients, people who still have not found anything so they are still in crisis situations or they are in emergency home-sharing situations we have set up within our supports within the community.

These numbers relate to a community that is extremely progressive. We take advantage of all housing initiatives that come down either federally or provincially. We work and we respond immediately in a lot of ways that most communities, from my involvement across the province, do not. They do not have community development the same way we do in North Bay, and what they are going through is horrific.

You can take the example of what is going on in Hastings county, where the municipal council wants the names and wants to personally assess each person on the welfare rolls. That is deplorable, and it should not be allowed. Any person who thinks that is acceptable does not deserve to be where they are, and maybe they should try walking for a bit in that other person's shoes and then would realize that the systems we have enshrined in this country are not appropriate and are obviously not meeting the needs of the majority of this country.

The whole illusion in this country of women having reached equality is a major hurdle that the provincial government needs to take immediate notice of and evaluate as well. Women represent the majority of Canada's population at 52%, yet we still continue to be treated as second-class citizens under this whole myth that we seem to have little or nothing to feed into the economic dominance of this country. This country would not be where it is if it were not for women, and it is time we recognize that and treat that as we should.

1200

We continue to be looked at by the dominant masses as a sexual commodity to simply harass, assault and view through a stereotypical window that sees our sexuality as a business opportunity. These things have to change. I am not comfortable with that environment existing and thriving while my daughter is growing up, and I cannot believe anybody else with a daughter would be comfortable with it either.

To simply maintain a system that forces most women that are involved in abusive and battering situations from the time of birth and then later on into adulthood to be economically dependent on their assailants speaks for itself, and I do not think I even have to go into that any further.

Employment equity and pay equity need more than lipservice. They need a blanketing piece of legislation that

expands both options and exits to all women. This has to include both the public and private sector employers. Exploitation must become a thing of the past.

It is time we took things seriously. Every time we seem to come up with a piece of legislation, it is either time limited or it only targets the public sector. It does not target the private sector, and people are working in horrific environments. They are not safe employment environments, and again people end up trapped on this whole so-called safety net, which is not a safety net, but a trap of social assistance. What happens is that rips your spirit. It takes away any type of motivation you have. You cannot function within that system because you are constantly getting doors slammed in your face and you are getting slapped around, literally, every time you try to move ahead or take an advancement.

If you try to go back to school, you cannot get the infrastructure to meet your child care needs, nor can you if your child is sick and you are in a workplace environment that does not respect the needs of meshing family responsibilities with employment standards, making it equitable, and takes advantage of the family situations in our society.

We have a perfect example right now. Last week, a local employer shut down. This employer has been using government initiatives to keep paying his employees for over a year, and now what happens is they close down and all these people are going to end up back on assistance. Most of them are women, because it was a program where they targeted single mothers because they see them as an untapped resource, but if you are willing to untap that resource, you have to provide the infrastructures people need to be able to survive to meet that. You cannot just constantly be feeding one side of the scale and not the other, because there is going to be a major crash. Anyone who is involved in business knows that. They cannot retrain their employees. The literacy levels we are dealing with are deplorable, and something has to be done about that as well.

There are statistics included in the report that demonstrate this fully and back up what I am saying. But I guess the main point I would like to get across is that this information is only the tip of the iceberg. If the province is serious and you are going across the province having these hearings, then there are some essential steps that the government has to take immediately. They have to deal with homelessness. They have to deal with hunger. They have to deal with poverty. They have to target full employment and the infrastructures, training and opportunities that people need to be able to meet those needs and demands.

They have to make discrimination illegal and enforce it. Having something on paper and giving it lipservice does no good, because I can take a native family in this community to go and look at an apartment and people will not say it behind their backs, they will say it right to their faces, "We do not rent to Indians here." That is deplorable. That should not be allowed in this day and age. There is a time that has to stop and the time is now. It should have been years ago, but we will settle for today.

I also think we have to deal with all of the massive economic and social inequalities in our province first.

Maybe it is a little bit backwards but in my mind I can honestly say that what I see is a province that does not fully have its social and economic policies functioning at an acceptable level. We are holding hearings on how to tell the federal government to do what it is doing better and we have not got our system organized well enough yet either.

If we are serious about what we want to do as a province, I think it is time the province developed some policies that relate directly to the rights and freedoms of children. We do not have any immediate policies as they relate to children and we need to establish housing as a fundamental right. If people have a solid base to work from, then they can move on ahead and they do not need all the structured and dependence-building types of systems that we have set up.

We need to establish a new provincial Human Rights Code that goes beyond rhetoric and is followed through. It is essential that the province enshrine equal rights for everyone as they encompass an adequate standard of living. This standard has to include a market-basket approach that contains self-optional access to adequate food, clothing, housing, education, medical care and appropriate social services. Then we can look to federally getting into place a social charter, which we do need to establish in a viable way, that will guarantee the constitutional right of a life of peace and dignity for everyone, free of poverty and homelessness and discrimination and violence.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mrs Mitchell, for reminding us of some of those realities that we need to cope with. There are a couple of questions. Mr Beer, to start.

Mr Beer: Lana, I wonder if you could go into a little more detail on I think a fundamental issue that you raised in your comments which is around the kinds of rights and values that we try to enshrine in our Constitution and our legislation, and then the reality that people face in trying to make sure that in fact we live up to the kind of society that we say we are trying to create.

You were involved in the social assistance review. You are involved now in what I hope will be a major substantive change in terms of bringing together the Family Benefits Act and the General Welfare Assistance Act. Through your own life experience you have seen how a great deal of that whole area functions or does not function. We have talked and I think your own committee looked at—as I suppose Colin Maloney did in the Children First report where he and his committee tried to set out what they referred to as entitlements that children ought to have—whether we needed to set out certain basic rights in the new legislation that would make clear what it was we were trying to do. Yet I have a sense that, even if we do that, we still have to implement all of that in a way that in fact lives up to the ideals and the values that we set out there.

Where do you see the problem? Is it simply one of political will, that those of us who have been there before have perhaps gone a certain way but have not been able to go as far as we ought to have? What causes this to break down? What do we need to do to make sure that we get done the kinds of things that sitting around a table we

would all I think agree we want to have done in a society, yet if we are all honest, we have to recognize that we ain't there yet? What is your sense of that dilemma?

Ms Mitchell: I have always found it just really frustrating and I have never been able to quite figure out some of the sort of hypocritical moves we tend to make. We set up a shelter allowance, for example, under social assistance and we set it up below what we know the average rents are across the province. What was the point of doing that? Were we literally targeting to keep people so that they still could not get access to those homes, and we are just going to be more obvious about it now?

I do not see enough co-ordination between the ministries, and I think that is vital and really important. You have a rent registry that goes on by the Ministry of Housing. They can pull immediately what the average rents are and they can pull substandard housing out of that, to a degree. They know what the follow-throughs are. We have a Ministry of Health that knows what people need medically. We have legislation that we put into place, and I think if people spent a little more time when they are writing that legislation thinking, "This may apply to me some day," it would be written a hell of a lot better. Think of it that way and look at it.

I often think when I go down and meet with MPPs at Queen's Park, I am going to bring a little Fisher Price family and, when they come out with these just phenomenal ideas in their minds, I am going to say: "Well, you can take this member of the family. I'm going to go throw them out the door because you totally forgot about them. It's not going to work for this family because there is no follow-through, there is no test."

If you were in business and you were going to open up a firm to sell—I do not know; I cannot really think of anything right now—yo-yos, for example, you would make sure there was a market for them. We should be doing the same thing in social services. We should make sure that what we are going to offer to people there is a market for and it is the market we want. To get on to social assistance is hard enough; to get off it is next to impossible. And that is not the way it should be at all.

Thank God that system is there, and I can say that personally because at 17 I had a daughter and I raised her on my own, but to try to go back to school did not work. To try to get child care to go back to school did not work. I did not even have an outfit to wear to go to a job interview, even if I had had the skills. There are so many things that to me just seem so obvious that we are constantly leaving out, and after a while you begin to wonder if it is a plot or something.

I know that sounds paranoid, but that is how you start to feel because it seems like everybody says, "People never get off the social assistance." I challenge anyone that thinks that way to go on to social assistance and try it, because it just does not work that way. If you open up an opportunity planning unit or you try to do anything that relates to prevention or promotion, you are penalized for it.

1210

When I had credit counselling when I was on social assistance, I had taken my daughter's baby bonus and set it up in a trust fund for her so that I could have a university savings plan for her and I was docked that money. That is disgusting, as if they want my daughter to stay where I am. How could you even expect a parent to want that for her children? That type of thing should be promoted and not discouraged.

I think spending more time in the outfield—I think there should be case load management. You have people making major decisions who have not talked to a consumer on that system in ages. That is why consumer counsellors would be so important because rather than having to have massive reviews at all times they could have ongoing facilitative co-operation and talking back and forth, as long as it is safeguarded and the bureaucrats are not allowed to use it and abuse it and just rubber-stamp things.

Mr Malkowski: I was very impressed with what you said, especially points that have moved me pertaining to the oppression of the system. Just to briefly say something, an experience I had gone through, I also went through the welfare system. I was a recipient and I went through also the vocational rehabilitation system. I said that I was bankrupt and I had legal fees and I was a father of four and I was labelled a slow learner. With all of those little labels and what you just depicted this morning, I could see where you were a victim and so was I. We need to see that there is a better system, especially accessibility, so we can have a support system, we can support one another; also development in the area of flexibility of regulations so we can have training for people to enter into the workforce.

As a VR counsellor, my previous position, I saw the other side on how the system operates, especially how they respond and how we can develop some sort of advocate position looking at the resources and the economic situation we face. You were very clear on your point regarding the Constitution and protecting the rights of children, the rights of family protection and exploitation and abuse. We need the welfare system to work for us and also to provide access in legal services arenas and to give poverty-stricken families access to training and education. We have to look at the values, and I think we have to incorporate the values you have displayed to us this morning into our Constitution.

The Chair: Do you want to make a comment on that at all, Ms Mitchell?

Ms Mitchell: Just that I appreciate those comments and I respect them. I am glad that you are where you are because now hopefully we will see some changes.

The Chair: Thank you very much again for your presentation.

Could I call Carol Jean from l'ACFO de Kirkland. Est-ce qu'elle est ici ? Non ?

ANITA CORRIVEAU

The Chair: Anita Corriveau.

Mme Corriveau : Distingués membres du comité, bonjour. Ma présentation sera courte et sera basée et sur le respect et la différence. De plus, je l'ai mise sur du vert, la

couleur de l'espoir. Quand on a des adolescents à la maison, on espère à tous les jours.

Je vous remercie de me donner la chance de comparaître devant vous aujourd'hui afin de partager mes aspirations, mes inquiétudes, mes désirs, mes joies et mes recommandations. En tant que femme, en tant que francophone, mère de deux enfants, épouse, enseignante, gouverneure à la Fédération des enseignantes et des enseignants de l'Ontario, conseillère à l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, je viens vous livrer un message, vous parler de ma vision.

Le gouvernement a mis sur pied un comité spécial ou une commission comme tant d'autres qui se baladent d'un coin du pays à l'autre. Moi, je les appelle des commissions à réaction. Réaction à qui ? Réaction à quoi ? Vous le savez sans doute et moi je m'en doute : réaction à la commission Bélanger-Campeau. Je ne m'attarderai pas à vous énumérer tous ces groupes de consultation car je suis heureuse aujourd'hui d'avoir un mot à vous dire. Et me voilà.

Pour le résultat de ces orgies de consultation, eh bien, on verra. Je suis tout de même très optimiste face au nouveau gouvernement.

Laissons aux Québécoises et aux Québécois le choix, il est le leur. Parlons de nous, les Franco-Ontariennes et les Franco-Ontariens. Nous sommes ici depuis déjà très longtemps, c'est-à-dire au moins 350 ans, et nous y sommes pour y rester ; aussi bien nous accepter. Je suis Franco-Ontarienne.

Nous avons dû nous battre pour les droits que nous avons acquis jusqu'à présent et nous n'avons aucunement l'intention de lâcher. Si les tribunaux sont nos seuls recours, eh bien, ils le seront. J'espère que non. Comme femme francophone c'est une double tâche, comme femme francophone autochtone, j'ai des points d'interrogation.

Le gouvernement doit reconnaître officiellement la dualité linguistique. Il faut un courage et une volonté de fer pour poser un tel geste, car il y a aura sûrement de l'opposition, mais je crois sincèrement que l'occasion est propice et il faut agir maintenant pour éviter de réagir.

Je parlais tantôt de commissions à réaction, passons à une commission d'action. Oui, l'Ontario se doit d'être un leader et c'est vous les élus qui allez le démontrer.

Les Franco-Ontariennes et Franco-Ontariens ont acquis des droits aux compte-gouttes et le temps est venu de leur donner un bon verre d'eau. Il faut se parler, se comprendre et s'accepter dans le respect. De plus, il faut enseigner la tolérance et le respect à nos enfants. Je le fais aujourd'hui pour mes enfants et c'est ce que j'enseigne en salle de classe également, le respect de la différence — vous connaissez le dicton «Vive la différence» ? et bien aujourd'hui encore plus que jamais.

Le gouvernement doit, de plus, procéder à l'établissement de l'éventail complet d'institutions dans le domaine de l'éducation, à partir des garderies jusqu'aux collèges et aux universités francophones, assurant ainsi la survie de la francophonie en Ontario. Le financement de ces institutions va de soi, et ce au même titre que nos collègues anglophones. Soyez prêts aussi à reconnaître ces mêmes besoins chez les autochtones. Il faut éviter d'avoir recours aux tribunaux quant au respect du droit à l'éducation en langue française, et ce à travers le pays.

L'Ontario doit démontrer un leadership et devenir un modèle très important dans le débat constitutionnel et reconnaître ses trois peuples fondateurs. La communauté francophone doit être dotée de structures politiques et administratives, des services essentiels à son épanouissement. C'est un besoin fondamental à notre survie.

Le gouvernement doit encore reconnaître le statut légal de la communauté francophone et le refléter dans l'organisation des pouvoirs, tant au palier fédéral, provincial que municipal, de même pour ce que le peuple autochtone demandera.

En conclusion, je désire remercier sincèrement les 12 commissaires et je vous laisse mes quelques recommandations : que le gouvernement reconnaisse officiellement la dualité linguistique, tant sur le plan provincial qu'au plan municipal ; que le gouvernement garantisse les institutions francophones, toute la gamme, ainsi que le financement complet ; que le gouvernement accepte de travailler avec les autres provinces et le gouvernement fédéral pour assurer le maintien du bilinguisme dans les institutions gouvernementales.

1220

Vous avez souvent entendu le mot «leader», le mot «modèle», le mot «respect», le mot «différence», le mot «tolérance». Moi, je suis fière d'être Franco-Ontarienne et je suis fière aussi du nouveau gouvernement élu et je crois sincèrement que l'Ontario se doit de prendre position et d'être un leader dans ce débat.

Je vous remercie de votre attention et je vous souhaite bonne chance dans vos délibérations prochaines face aux décisions que vous aurez à prendre, face à la population ontarienne, aux francophones, aux anglophones et aux autochtones de l'Ontario.

M. le Président : Merci, madame. Est-ce il y a des questions ? Mrs O'Neill ?

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Thank you very much for your presentation. I certainly liked the word you chose to begin, which was hope. I like the other words you chose: vision, respect and understanding. I had some difficulty with your perception of what we are doing. I wanted to know whether you have read the document.

Mrs Corriveau : I did not receive it.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Okay. Changing for the Better. I hope you will take a copy of it. I would like to ask you then why you think this committee is reacting, if you have been watching, because if the hearings to this point have been any indication, Bélanger-Campeau has come up maybe once or twice, Allaire maybe 5 or 10 times, but there seems to be a real Ontario stamp to what we are hearing, is my perception, rather than a reaction to what is going on outside. I wondered if you would tell us where you get the perception that we are reacting or that this committee is a reaction.

Mme Corriveau : Oui. D'abord, avec toutes les commissions qui ont été établies, c'est peut-être des fausses perceptions que nous avons eues et personnellement, j'ai eu l'impression que c'était peut-être une commission à réaction. J'aimerais mieux que ce soit une commission d'action. C'est ce que j'espère que ça va devenir.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I think if you read the questions you will see that we are asking Ontarians to think about their own values. We are asking them to think about where Ontario places itself in Confederation, as the committee's name itself states, and like you have suggested, we have set aside one whole section of questions on the native issue, which I am very happy that we have heard included many times this morning.

I really do feel this is becoming a model and I think the way in which this committee is making itself accessible and involving a number of people every day and travelling as we are, I think you will see it is more proactive than maybe your original impression. I hope you will definitely take the document, and because you are so interested and have your unique background and because you are a teacher, I think you said, we would like you to respond to the questions if you have time to do that and send them to us. Thank you.

Mr Harris : Anita, one of the difficulties that the provinces and the federal government have found in the striving for this Constitution that is acceptable is that most of the groups that have come before it, including the provinces themselves in provincial-federal powers—I mean, half of the Constitution is how the powers are going to be divided up and the other main thrust is the individual rights being protected through the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The difficulty that first ministers have found themselves in, and those negotiating to try to come to a consensus, is that everybody seems to feel that all their problems can be solved in a constitutional document and everybody wants this document to be perfect. We heard an excellent presentation from Lana of many things that are very wrong and we would all agree with that. Yet, we have to wrestle with: "Can they be solved in a Constitution. Is that the right vehicle to solve all the problems of the world? Are we going to solve all the native concerns in a Constitution?"

Let me get to the concerns of Franco-Ontarians of rights, of services, of equality that they seek in Ontario. Do you feel that they can be resolved in the Constitution or is it something that we can come to some consensus on to keep our country together and agree on federal-provincial powers and agree on some rights that have to be enshrined, accept that it is a long way from perfect, accept that it will need refinement over the next 100,000 years—hopefully, that we are still together, year by year, decade by decade—and in that vehicle still satisfy the concerns of Franco-Ontarians that their concerns can be addressed equally as well?

I have been a little philosophical as well, but the truth of the matter is this is what this committee is trying to do. We are trying to hear from Ontarians, we are trying to get a viewpoint of what it is they want. Then we must represent a viewpoint to the other provinces and to the federal government that says this type of constitutional framework will allow us to work towards what Ontarians want out of Canada, and what Newfoundlanders want, and the west and the others. But we are never going to be able to solve all the problems in the Constitution.

So you are before our committee. Do you have any thoughts on that, of many of the things you were asking Ontario to do? Does it matter if we even have a Constitution at all? I mean, would life go on and could Franco-Ontarians meet their aspirations and goals even if we do not have a country or a Constitution? I think we have to start to ask these kinds of questions because we are never going to have a perfect document.

Mme Corriveau : Je peux répondre ?

M. le Président : Oui.

Mme Corriveau : Oui, certainement, basé sur un consensus comme tu a mentionné, et ce consensus-là doit être basé sur le respect de l'individu. C'est à travers des forums comme celui-ci qu'on va aller chercher l'input des gens pour essayer de mieux répondre à leurs besoins.

La dame juste précédente mentionnait qu'il y a des problèmes au niveau des services sociocommunautaires. C'est peut-être le temps maintenant d'aller former un forum, d'aller chercher ces gens-là, à savoir de quelle façon on peut mieux répondre à leurs besoins.

Alors, on revient à un forum de consultation comme ça avant qu'il n'y ait une crise.

M. le Président : Merci, madame. On est très conscient, en tant que comité, de notre rôle, ce que vous avez appelé la nécessité d'être un comité d'action, et je crois qu'on va essayer de répondre à ces besoins.

1230

VICTOR BOLDT

The Chair: I call next Victor Boldt.

Mr Boldt: Mr Chairman and honourable members here, my vision of Canada is maybe a little bit unusual. I am surprised that it has not been mentioned so far. It seems almost self-evident to me that John A. Macdonald, when he first thought of Canada, had a vision of a central, unified government with an unwritten Constitution modelled upon the British system. That vision was interfered with when he met with George-Étienne Cartier, representing the francophone community in Quebec. The situation was unusual. I want to compare what has happened in Germany since the Second World War.

The Germans, being a defeated people, had a federal government imposed upon them by the victorious allies as a punishment to reduce their efficiency in government and in military operations as well. Now, that same imposition has been made upon us by a defeated minority, francophone people in Quebec, not as a punishment but as an adversary measure to maintain their own authority against an enemy who has conquered them and they want to maintain their parity, their control in government.

Now, that situation is about to end because Quebec is going to leave us. I think the handwriting is on the wall. I think that is a given, and so what I think we have to do is go back to the original plan that John A. Macdonald had in mind. I think I can persuade you that there are a number of benefits.

For example, provincial licences to professional people such as medical doctors, lawyers, dentists, university professors, engineers, what have you: when those people

graduate from provincial universities, their access to other provinces for practice is strictly limited. Now, I know that every year Americans come to the Park Plaza Hotel in Toronto and they advertise and get medical doctors and nurses who depart and leave this country. We call that a brain drain and it is happening all the time because of provincial regulations. If we had a national standard, it would not happen. It would not be completely eliminated, but it would be reduced.

Licences for skilled craftsmen: I had a plumber who did a job for me. In Expo 67, when he tried to go to Montreal to work on a job which was incomplete, funded by the federal government, he was denied a chance to work his trade because he was a foreigner coming from Ontario. I think that is a disastrous situation.

Canadian truckers need 10 licences, 10 sets of regulations to cross Canada. That is a disaster.

Canadian brewers: They need provincial authority. They must build in every province where they sell beer. Both truckers and brewers, I note, are exempt from the free trade regulations because they simply cannot compete. They have been exempted, and I say if we removed provincial regulations, we would be in a position to compete.

Now, Ontario divorce courts are a problem. I do not know how many women in Ontario are divorced and expecting alimony payments from their husbands. About 80% of them is the figure—I could be wrong about that—are not receiving them because their husbands have simply reneged on their government order. The easy technique they have is to absent themselves and go to a foreign province where there is no extradition treaty, and that does happen.

Dr Henry Morgentaler, for example, is providing a service to Canadian women. This is controversial I know, but he is a person who is relying upon the court system and he has had to go to court in every province where he intends to operate. I think this is a disastrous violation of the court system which should be stopped.

Trade and commerce: I can remember during the free trade negotiations American businessmen complained that in trying to arrange free trade, they had to negotiate with 10 separate fiefdoms. That is the phrase I remember. The federal government had to engage a civil servant by the name of Lise Lachapelle—I remember her name very well—to approach each separate provincial government separately to see if she could persuade them to relax on some of their provincial regulations on trade so that they could deal with the American companies. This is disastrous. We have Meech Lake, which gives the provinces extra rights, and we have a free trade deal which requires a stronger federal government and it seems to me that the Meech Lake hand does not know what the free trade hand is doing.

Oh, education is most important. At the present time, when a member of the armed forces of Canada living in Cold Lake, Alberta gets transferred to Ottawa or to North Bay, his dependants are in real trouble. The principle of the school where they attend has to decide, what grade will that person be in? Will he be in grade 3 for arithmetic, grade 5 for history, grade 7 for something else, sometimes

grade nothing for something because they did not have music in Alberta? I think that is a disaster and it is a serious imposition upon our Canadian armed forces and it restricts transfers of people across the country.

All of these can be eliminated, I think, by eliminating the provincial powers which exist at the present time. If we have a unified central government, the federal government can handle all of this. There is a tremendous overlapping of jurisdictions. Those of us who remember the flooding of the Sturgeon River, Lake Nipissing and French River watershed remember that we had great difficulty deciding who was responsible for controlling the level of the waters at any level. It was difficult to pin down because there were so many levels of jurisdiction, and this is a characteristic of Canada.

There are a tremendous number of overlapping jurisdictions; for example, Indian affairs. The Constitution gives these powers to the federal government, but it seems to me that all the provinces are involved in this, especially the province of Quebec. The Department of National Health and Welfare is involved; taxation—Quebec taxes, other provinces do not; the Department of National Defence. I am disturbed that at Oka, the Premier of Quebec was in control of the Canadian armed forces. That bothers me.

Senate reform is another proposal I have. To take up the powers of the provinces, senators would represent those provinces, and I have three different plans in mind; at least they are all in the books, anyway. The triple E Senate, which is elected, equal and effective, has been proposed by Premier Getty. Premier Wells, I notice, has now endorsed it, and both of them have a special purpose in mind. They want to control the powers of the two central provinces now, Ontario and Quebec, which may, because of their population majorities, be unfair in legislation against the western provinces. I think that is a legitimate desire.

There is another plan for the Senate, Premier Peterson's half-elected and half-appointed version. Minorities can be represented by appointment. For example, if we have problems with our Indian minorities, our francophone minorities in other provinces, the Jews or what have you, they can be represented by appointment in the Senate. I notice that this plan is now being used in India, and I am told that it is fairly successful, although I do not know personally.

Of course, there is another special joint committee on Senate reform which is tabled in the House, and it gives the west larger representation.

Now, here we have three plans and we are fooling around with the idea of Senate reform. No one is doing anything about it. We want a federal government that will do something about it.

One more thing. These federal-provincial meetings between premiers and prime ministers I think are a disgrace, with all the wrangling as to who is going to control what and the fed-bashing. Pierre Elliott Trudeau used to complain about it. It was fed-bashing from beginning to end, and the premiers would get on television and put on their nice suits and cater to their home audiences. It was provin-

cial patriotism against federal patriotism, and I think it is not healthy.

Other quarrels we had: the Alberta oilfields and the national energy program. Who controlled the oilfields in Alberta? That was a point of dispute. The offshore oilfields of Newfoundland: another point of dispute. This has got to end.

I say the solution is to let Quebec go independent the way it wants. At this moment I hear two voices at the same time from Brian Mulroney and Keith Spicer and they are shouting at me, "Bigot." I say: "Come on. Put on your thinking caps. I am only accepting the positions of Jacques Parizeau of the Parti québécois and Lucien Bouchard of the Bloc québécois, and in Quebec they are now heroes. They are going to be patriots and one of them is going to be the first Prime Minister of Quebec. If I am going to be associated with those people, I want to be a national hero in Ontario as well as they are. I am not a bigot at all.

The person I fear, though, is Robert Bourassa. When he presents his Allaire commission—well, it has already been presented, I see—he is going to curtail the provinces and the federal government so badly it is going to be worse than the British North America Act, worse than Meech Lake. It is the next, third step, and I am thinking that what they are after is to break up the country into 10 separate blocs and then they can be independent and be one of a number of 10. That may be revenge for the battle of the Plains of Abraham, I do not know.

Speaking of the battle of the Plains of Abraham, I am sorry to say that there is a lot of hard feeling. It is still there. Animosity is still there. If you go to Quebec City, look for a statue of General Wolfe. You will not find one. You may find a small stone about this big and it says, "Here lies," or "Here General Wolfe had his last drink of water. God bless him," or something like that, and then you look at the statue of Montcalm. It is magnificent and it is immense. It has a stone banister around it and then flowers around it.

You have the impression, "Je me souviens." I ask the man, "Je me souviens de quoi?" And he says, "Je me souviens que nous étions français, we remember when we were French." So I asked him, "Well, what are you now?" "Well, we're Québécois. We are Canadiens, but not Canadian." And when Prime Minister Mulroney keeps talking, "They are Canadians," he is not telling the truth, because they do not think of themselves in that way at all. Incidentally, every licence plate in the province of Quebec has got the same impression: "Je me souviens." They have been in mourning because they were associating with us for all of this time. I mean, how can we win?

1240

How did this come to be? If you really want to know about how Québécois think, go to some of their churches. You will find out. The Roman Catholic Church has been building up this hostility with its assistant, the Saint-Jean-Baptiste Society. Did you ever see one of these Saint-Jean-Baptiste societies? They control the province. They control language, religion and nationalism. and these are the same forces which are wrecking the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics today. The Soviet Union is falling apart on these

forces. I will say it again: language, religion, nationalism, and those are the same forces which are breaking up Canada today. This is not the end. If Quebec goes, other religious and national forces may come about.

Now if I am a bigot, I am in good company, because Hugh MacLennan who wrote the novel *Two Solitudes* back in 1945 said exactly the same thing that I am saying now. I am sorry our politicians have not read the novel.

We have other benefits. We can stop pretending and recognize that we are giving \$10 billion in equalization payments to Quebec every year for which it is not grateful. We can reduce the national debt of \$350 billion over a period of 35 years and then we can have no GST. We do not even need it.

The bilingualism situation, the bilingualism program, I think, has been a disaster. Monolingualism in Quebec has caused a lot of dissension there, and the two bilingualism programs under Trudeau and Mulroney have caused an awful lot of hard feelings in the rest of the country. I am not suggesting that francophones should not speak French, but what is happening—this is the perception—is that people who speak French are being given extra bonuses by being given promotions and job opportunities not available to English-speaking or other people. I am talking about the armed forces, the RCMP, the federal civil service and the provincial civil service. I think there is something in that.

The eternal wrangling between Quebec and anglophone people, I think, should come to an end, and here is a perfect opportunity. I do not see it happening under Prime Minister Mulroney, because with Meech Lake and the Oka crisis, he has really disgraced himself. I think he is the central force of disunity in this country. For example, only yesterday, in a speech in Ontario talking about Canadian unity, he came up with a plan. When Quebec goes, he says, Ontario is going to dominate and it is going to have the powers of veto and it is going to govern this country just as Quebec did. This man is supposed to be making a speech on unity? I think he is the greatest force for disunity we have had. I make a proposal for you. Let the man go by impeachment or any other means, and get someone who is interested in Canada. The only person I have in mind is Clyde Wells of Newfoundland, who has spoken so well for us on our behalf so far.

Ms Churley: Thank you. I just want to touch on a couple of things. You mentioned the word "perception." I think you used the correct words in terms of the word "perception," that francophones are getting more opportunities and benefits than, say, anglophones. I think that is a very important point, that in fact it is perception and that this is a bit of affirmative action going on here, because francophones have been left behind for so long. I am glad you used the word "perception." It is important that a lot of education be done around that.

I have to admit I personally disagree with your point of view. I would be very unhappy to see Quebec leave. I think that it is having the two cultures is what makes this culture great.

But I want to ask you a question. Specifically you seem to be suggesting that if Quebec were to leave, we would be able to easily form a central, strong government.

That seems to imply that there are not other provinces that also have a lot of problems with even the centralized government we have now. I believe that we would still have many of the same problems—the focus is on Quebec—that there are a lot of provinces that want to have more powers than they do now. So I just want to ask you why you think if Quebec left we would be able to form a strong central government.

Mr Boldt: I have to admit that the provinces were created as a result of the British North America Act, as a result of George Etienne Cartier's representation to John A. Macdonald. I have to admit that. But now that they are here, an awful lot of damage has been done and there is an awful lot of provincial nationalism or provincialism. I do not even know what the word is now, but there is a hostile feeling to the central government. It probably will be difficult to persuade them to adopt this attitude, but I am hoping that it can be done.

Mr Harnick: Sir, I do not wish to be derogatory in any way, but you have got somewhat of a cavalier approach as to how we are going to solve this problem. The approach really is, if Quebec wants to go, let them go. But there is an angle that you have neglected to talk about and it is a fact that between Ontario and Quebec \$30-billion worth of trade is done annually. How do you reconcile this cavalier approach you have taken with the economic reality? What happens to the \$30-billion worth of trade? How is it maintained?

Mr Boldt: I have no objection to trade. We are trading with Canada, Mexico, all kinds of countries. I do not object to trading with Quebec.

Mr Harnick: But with all due respect to you, if you take the cavalier approach, can you guarantee that the ability to continue that trade is going to be there? People in Ontario can be hurt very badly in an economic sense, as can people in Quebec. I do not think you have thought your position out.

Mr Boldt: Mr Harnick, I think—

Mr Harnick: You have not dealt with the economic reality is what I am telling you. I am giving you the opportunity to do that now.

Mr Boldt: As I say, Canada trades with Mexico, with Japan, with the United States, with any number of countries. I do not see any restrictions. I do not think that separating into a different country is going to restrict trade whatsoever; no change.

Mr Bisson: I wish you were right, that there are not any restrictions when it comes to trade, because one of the difficulties we have with our economy today is the problems we are having with access to the American market.

I am interested in one thing that you are saying, because I tend to take an opposite view when it comes to federalism. I believe, yes, that we need to have a strong federal government to a certain point, but you seem to imply that by giving the provinces more powers and the ability to control their own destiny and to develop their own programs suited to their regional needs, that somehow is detrimental to the nation on a whole.

I would like to take as an example Canada overall. We have not done too badly for ourselves over the past 120-odd years. We have managed to build a fairly equitable nation that provides for the sick, for the old and for the unfortunate, a fairly good standard of education we still need to work on. The thing is, where I am having a hard time is if we are saying we give all of the control over to the federal system. How do we recognize the regional differences that are within the country?

People right now I think are tending to aim at Quebec as being the only place that has regional differences, but we are from the north, you and I, and we recognize there are regional differences here in northern Ontario that sometimes are not appreciated in other parts of this country, even for that fact, in this province, or the west or the east or the far north. How are you able to develop programs that are specifically targeted to the needs of that region, such as northern Ontario, if you do not have control of your own agenda in being able to put that forward?

I would be very interested because I think we have done a fairly good job with the federal system that we have, which does allow provinces to have some power but the federal government then sets standards, such as it did back in the 1960s when we introduced the current medical care program that we have now. It was a province that came out with the idea.

Mr Boldt: Right.

Mr Bisson: And eventually introduced it in the province and consequently the federal system put standards by which every other province across this nation benefited.

Mr Boldt: Right.

Mr Bisson: Explain to me how you are saying we need to set national standards, because we have done fairly well the other way.

Mr Boldt: May I answer, Mr Chairman?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr Boldt: In my submission I thought I approached that, but maybe I have not said enough. The United States has a wonderful system in its Senate, in which two senators per state represent their regional interests. What I suggested here, and maybe it was not put—

Mr Bisson: But they do not have the social fabric we have in this country. That is a big difference. that is what I am saying.

Mr Boldt: Perhaps I may finish, though.

Mr Bisson: Okay.

Mr Boldt: Every province, or if you put them together, lump them together in regions which might be even more equitable, every region or province represented by senators would then be accountable for their particular region, and these people would be elected and that seems to make the difference I think in the United States and it should make the difference in Canada.

Mr Bisson: I tend to disagree.

The Chair: All right. I think we will end there. Thank you, Mr Boldt. That concludes the list of speakers for this morning. We will recess at this point until 2 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 1251.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1410.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. We are resuming our hearings this afternoon from the Royal Canadian Legion hall in North Bay. We heard this morning from a number of speakers and we have an afternoon and evening of further speakers to hear from.

FÉDÉRATION DES FEMMES
CANADIENNES-FRANÇAISES

DÉPARTEMENT D'HISTOIRE DE L'ÉCOLE
SECONDAIRE ALGONQUIN

The Chair: I call Julie Champagne and Bernard Giroux to come forward. I gather it is a joint presentation.

Mme Champagne : Bonjour, bon après-midi tout le monde. Mon mémoire est au nom de la Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises et du département d'histoire de l'école secondaire Algonquin de North Bay.

La Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises a vu le jour en Ontario en 1914, lors de la crise du Règlement 17. Depuis, cet organisme s'est toujours fait un devoir de servir la cause de la francophonie, constamment remise en question dans la province et même dans le pays. Il est donc du devoir de toutes nos membres de faire front commun à ce moment-ci pour défendre les droits linguistiques et culturels de notre minorité.

Depuis la conquête de 1759, le Canada a connu des difficultés face à son identité. En effet, une longue suite de tergiversation tissa son histoire à partir d'essais réels d'assimilation repris avec plus ou moins de véhémence sporadiquement ou de façon moins fracassante à d'autres moments. Même si le gouvernement canadien s'est efforcé d'apporter des modifications temporaires par certaines aménités récentes—la Commission sur le bilinguisme et le biculturalisme, ou la Loi sur les services en français de l'Ontario—ces solutions n'ont pas vraiment touché à la source profonde et réelle du problème, à cause de l'atmosphère psychologique dans laquelle ces mesures furent édictées. Récemment, les protestations du Sault-Sainte-Marie autant que les pourparlers de l'accord du Lac Meech en font foi.

Tous les Canadiens et Canadiennes, aussi longtemps qu'ils aient vécu, sont plus ou moins hantés et même ennuyés par ces questions qui les divisent depuis trop longtemps.

En 1864, George Brown de l'Ouest canadien décrivait ainsi la situation : «Nous avons deux races, deux langues, deux systèmes de religion, deux systèmes de tout. Il a donc été impossible que, sans sacrifier leurs principes, les dirigeants des deux provinces se rencontrent pour former un gouvernement. Chaque année les difficultés se sont accrues».

Ainsi, les faits ont été établis depuis 1864 et même avant, et nous n'avons rien appris de différent depuis. Face aux mêmes problèmes qu'on ressasse encore aujourd'hui, quelle solution magique le Canada va-t-il pouvoir apporter à un problème aussi vieux ?

Étant donné que la Confédération avait avant tout un but économique sans trop de considérations pour la réalité sociale et culturelle, comme dit George Brown, au prix de «sacrifier des principes», il est évident que le peuple canadien a fait du chemin et qu'il n'est plus prêt à sacrifier ses intérêts culturels aujourd'hui. En conséquence, il convient d'aborder le problème sur ces deux composantes coexistentielles : l'aspect culturel et l'aspect économique.

Aspects à prendre en considération. Tous les humains sont égaux ; le peuple est diversifié dans sa langue et sa culture ; le discours culturel devrait englober tout les aspects du peuple canadien : autochtones, Français, Anglais ; et c'est l'Ontario qui doit prendre un rôle de leadership face au reste du Canada.

Si tous sont égaux, tous ont des droits, et nulle autre solution que l'égalité, c'est-à-dire droit aux deux groupes linguistiques dans leur langue et leur culture, et droits des Indiens à leurs territoires et à leur autonomie.

Dans le monde actuel, toutes les structures politiques éclatent à plus ou moins brève échéance pour répondre plus spécifiquement aux besoins différents des populations. Que ce soit en Chine ou en URSS, la force ne peut venir à bout de la volonté des peuples ; elle ne fait que retarder une échéance. L'Ontario se doit de prendre un rôle de leadership, non seulement à cause de sa force économique, mais aussi de par sa situation géographique. En effet, n'est-il pas normal de vouloir se joindre au plus fort ? De plus, l'Ontario abrite déjà le plus grand nombre de Canadiens de langue minoritaire commune. Le leadership de l'Ontario peut donc s'avérer de grande importance pour le reste du pays.

Dans la conjoncture actuelle, tout Canadien bien-né ne peut se résigner à voir le Canada divisé en son centre par la république du Québec. L'Ontario a donc plus que toute autre province avantage à faire partie de la meilleure solution pour tout le pays.

Enfin, l'heure est venue de trouver des solutions nouvelles aussi extravagantes qu'elles puissent être. Qu'on ose laisser de côté l'idée que la démocratie en terme de majorité doit prévaloir. Attardons-nous à l'autre aspect de la démocratie qui implique que tous les membres de notre société canadienne ont droit de se faire entendre et de se faire écouter. C'est la solution magique qui nous aidera à chanter encore pour de nombreuses années : «O Canada, terre de nos aïeux... ton histoire est une épopée des plus brillants exploits».

Cet exploit gigantesque que nous avons chanté depuis notre enfance, c'est dans la compréhension et la largeur d'esprit que nous devons l'explicitier aujourd'hui. En fait, le Canada a plus que moins souvent été bénéficiaire de sa diversité. C'est ce que l'Ontario se doit de souligner pour le plus grand bien de sa population, et encore une fois, c'est l'hymne national qui nous dicte de protéger nos foyers et nos droits.

Recommandations : Égalité de tous dans leur langue et leur culture ; égalité de soutien monétaire pour toutes les écoles subventionnées par le gouvernement ; égalité

d'emploi partout mais surtout en éducation ; droit des deux peuples minoritaires, francophones et autochtones du Canada, d'administrer leurs institutions eux-mêmes ; une province de l'Ontario officiellement bilingue ; une union économique des provinces genre CEE, communauté économique européenne. Merci de votre attention.

Mr Offer: One of the last recommendations you made was an economic union for all of the provinces. When I heard that recommendation, I tried to remember some of the things in your presentation; I did not hear a lead-up to that type of recommendation. Are you, as a result of that recommendation, somewhat acknowledging that there is going to be a sovereignty type of association with Quebec? Could just expand upon the reasons for that particular recommendation?

M. Giroux : Si jamais il y avait une discorde et qu'on ne pouvait pas arriver à une nouvelle entente entre toutes les provinces et les territoires sur le plan politique, il faudrait s'entendre sûrement sur le plan économique. Mais il est aussi préférable à l'intérieur de la Confédération que, même sur le plan économique, on ouvre davantage les frontières entre les provinces. On le fait avec les États-Unis avec le libre-échange. On essaie d'enlever autant de barrières tarifaires que possibles avec nos voisins du sud, mais entre les provinces on garde encore des frontières tarifaires. Ceci devrait disparaître.

1420

Ms Churley: You said when you spoke, "Put aside the idea of democracy," meaning the majority, "and all members of society should be heard and listened to." I wanted you to expand a bit on that, because, of course, we are here in this room and in this province to hear people, no matter what their views are. Some people are saying, for instance, that there should be referendums held on francophone issues or separation issues, that sort of thing. A speaker this morning—I do not know if you were here for that—talked about the fact that basically, if you listen to the majority of people, then you go in one direction; as a group listening to people we have to hear everybody, but we have to make sure that everybody, as much as possible, is equal in this society. I just wanted you to speak a little more to what you would advise this committee to do in terms of listening to all people's points of view and how we then take all those views and come to some kind of conclusions about what we are going to recommend and how we approach this whole big issue.

M. Giroux : En 1967, lorsqu'on a créé la Confédération, il n'y avait pas question de référendum ; on n'a jamais consulté la population. Des premiers ministres, des politiciens ont décidé à portes fermées qu'on était pour créer la Confédération. On sait que la population, en majorité, était contre l'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique tel qu'on le connaît maintenant. Et il n'aurait sûrement pas été sage de demander au grand public de voter, sous forme de référendum, à savoir si on voulait cet arrangement politique, parce que sûrement le référendum aurait rejeté l'idée de la Confédération ; la même chose aujourd'hui. Si jamais on demande au grand public de se prononcer sur les questions francophones qui leur tiennent à cœur, déjà on a

une bonne idée du résultat du référendum. Alors je crois qu'il est bon d'écouter tout le monde, toutes les gens qui ont quelque chose à dire, mais il faut que ce soit nos chefs, nos leaders — et en ce moment-ci je remarque que M. Harris n'est pas ici, c'est dommage — que nos chefs doivent prendre ces responsabilités parce qu'ils sont les gens supposément éclairés pour bien mener un peuple aussi diversifié qu'est le nôtre. Il ne faudrait pas qu'une majorité puisse, à travers un référendum, écraser des minorités ; et ce autant pour la question des francophones que pour la question des autochtones.

Mme Champagne : Je peux ajouter quelque chose ? Je voudrais aussi dire que, comme Bernard vient de dire, on n'a pas consulté la population lors de la Confédération, mais je pense qu'aujourd'hui vous considérez l'autre aspect de la démocratie, qui veut que vous consultiez la population. Je pense que la commission Silipo est un beau geste en ce genre qui, pour appuyer la démocratie, vient écouter la majorité ou la minorité.

M. le Président : Merci. Vous avez parlé du fait que le discours culturel devait englober, comme vous dites, tous les aspects du peuple canadien : les autochtones, les Français, les Anglais. Si je peux vous poser une question : où est-ce que vous mettez le tiers de la population canadienne qui n'appartient à aucun de ces trois groupes, c'est-à-dire la population multiculturelle, dans cette vision ?

M. Giroux : Nous croyons que multiculturalistes, tous ont une place égale dans notre société. Maintenant, sur le plan linguistique, je me base sur les deux peuples fondateurs du Canada et c'est pourquoi on a mentionné surtout les deux langues officielles, mais sans éliminer ou sans noyer toute autre culture qu'on retrouve au Canada. Au contraire ; toutes les cultures au Canada doivent prendre de l'ampleur. On doit encourager pour que chacun puisse conserver son patrimoine et en faire un meilleur Canada.

M. le Président : Merci. Je vous ai posé la question parce que j'avais l'impression que, basé sur ce que vous avez dit, c'était en effet votre position, mais des fois c'est nécessaire de mettre ces positions clairement devant tout le monde parce qu'il y a peut-être une possibilité de ne pas se comprendre sur ces aspects. Merci.

M. Giroux : Merci bien de nous avoir donné la chance d'exprimer nos opinions.

Mme Champagne: Merci de nous avoir écoutés.

JEAN-LOUIS BOURDEAU

M. le Président : Est-ce que je pourrai appeler maintenant Jean-Louis Bourdeau ?

M. Bourdeau : Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, je voudrais vous souhaiter la bienvenue chez nous. Je suis un Ontarien de cinquième génération. Mon arrière-arrière-grand-père a immigré, s'est établi dans le comté de Russell dans l'est de l'Ontario en 1859. Mes ancêtres ont demeuré là. Cependant, en 1941 alors que j'avais 18 ans, ça fait cinquante ans cette année, moi-même j'ai immigré dans le nord de l'Ontario. J'y ai passé toute ma vie, alors je me sens ici chez moi et ça me fait plaisir de vous souhaiter la bienvenue.

Je voudrais vous présenter ma vision du problème auquel les canadiens font face présentement et vous proposer certains éléments de solution puisque j'imagine que c'est ce que vous recherchez.

Présentement, la Confédération canadienne éprouve la crise la plus grave de son histoire. Pourquoi la plus grave ? Parce que cette fois-ci les citoyens ne veulent plus s'en remettre au seul chef politique pour régler la question. Ils veulent s'en mêler eux-mêmes. L'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique de 1867 a été le fruit d'un accord entre les chefs d'État du temps, bien connus sous le nom de pères de la Confédération. La population fit confiance à ses chefs politiques et accepta l'accord. Il y a eu d'autres crises constitutionnelles depuis ce temps, mais elles furent toutes traitées au niveau des politiciens. Les Canadiens francophones n'ont jamais été très à l'aise avec la constitution de 1867 qui garantissait certains droits aux anglophones au Québec mais aucun aux francophones des autres provinces.

C'est ce déséquilibre qui était la cause principale des frictions entre les anglophones et les francophones depuis plus de cent ans. Les anglophones devenaient de plus en plus majoritaires, tandis que pour les francophones c'était l'inverse.

Les Québécois, souffrant depuis longtemps du complexe de vaincu — on ne leur laissait pas oublier la bataille des plaines d'Abraham — ayant un niveau d'éducation inférieur aux anglophones, défavorisés sur le plan économique, n'arrivaient pas à rétablir l'équilibre. Cette situation a changé du tout au tout depuis la révolution tranquille. Ayant découvert une identité nationale qui leur est propre, les Québécois, maintenant mieux éduqués, ont fondé des institutions financières et sociales qui leur donnent un sentiment d'autonomie. Ils se sentent capables de prendre leur destinée en main. Ils ne se sentent inférieurs dans aucun domaine et ils ont perdu leur complexe de vaincus. Même plus, ils disent carrément à leurs chefs politiques ce qu'ils attendent d'eux en matière de droit constitutionnel.

1430

C'est ce que fait la gravité de la crise actuelle. Cette fois, il ne suffira pas de satisfaire les élus québécois ; il faudra satisfaire le peuple québécois lui-même. Il y a aussi un autre aspect de la crise actuelle qui n'était pas très évident dans les crises précédentes. Il s'agit de la question des peuples autochtones. Nous l'avons toujours ignorée jusqu'à maintenant, mais cela n'est plus possible. Il faut rendre justice au peuple qui habitait ce territoire avant nous.

Le Canada a une bien drôle d'histoire. Les Français sont arrivés et ils ont bousculé les tribus indiennes. Ils les ont refoulées sur les plus pauvres territoires du pays tandis que les anglophones dans les colonies anglaises, aux États-Unis — ce qui s'appelle les États-Unis maintenant — faisaient exactement la même chose. On est aussi coupable l'un que l'autre. Ensuite sont arrivés les anglophones qui se sont emparés du Canada, du Québec par la force des armes et qui ont fait la même chose ensuite aux Français. Alors, ça a été une bousculade par la force des armes.

Je suppose que dans la civilisation du temps, c'était acceptable. Ça se faisait. Aujourd'hui ça ne l'est pas. Notre

pays lui-même, le Canada participe actuellement à une guerre pour déloger un tyran qui s'est emparé d'un autre pays par la force et on ne peut pas tolérer ça. On y va et on va le sortir.

Ce contrôle d'un peuple par la force n'est plus quelque chose d'acceptable aujourd'hui. Si nous voulons régler la question constitutionnelle de façon définitive cette fois, il ne suffira pas de proposer des changements mineurs ou de demi-mesure. Il faudra changer nos attitudes les uns envers les autres. Il faudra se débarrasser de nos préjugés, de notre soif de dominer et de contrôler les autres communautés.

Il faudra cesser de penser et de parler de groupes majoritaires et de groupes minoritaires mais plutôt de partenaires égaux. Ce ne sont que deux mots, mais là se trouve la solution définitive à nos différends. Si on veut vraiment régler la question une fois pour toutes, il faut en arriver là. Si les francophones jouissaient d'un statut, d'institutions et de services égaux aux anglophones d'un bout à l'autre du pays, et si les autochtones étaient maîtres de leur destinée sur leur propre territoire, je verrais un pays paisible et des Canadiens heureux. Un tel projet est-il réalisable ?

Le Québec a déjà fait connaître sa position. Les autochtones ont fait de même avec force ces dernières années. La réponse appartient donc aux anglophones. Présentement, il est difficile de savoir ce qu'ils pensent. Un certain nombre se disent opposés à dialoguer plus longtemps, mais je ne crois pas qu'ils représentent les sentiments de la majorité. Il faut donc absolument que cette majorité se manifeste clairement. Il faudra plus que des mots, il faut des actes clairs et concrets. Veulent-ils, oui ou non, avoir les francophones et les autochtones comme partenaires à part entière dans ce pays ? S'ils n'agissent pas, le Canada se séparera bientôt du Québec. Ça ne serait pas la première fois, d'ailleurs.

Il y a 200 ans que c'est arrivé pour la première fois lorsque le Parlement de Londres a créé la province du Haut-Canada. Ce territoire-ci, déjà c'était le territoire québécois, c'était du territoire français. C'est en 1791 que le Parlement de Londres a divisé le territoire en deux provinces : le Haut- et le Bas-Canada, et on a pris une partie du territoire pour créer la province du Haut-Canada qui maintenant s'appelle l'Ontario, et c'était pour accommoder une nouvelle population anglophone qui était à la veille d'y immigrer.

Les conséquences très graves d'une telle séparation nous incitent à une profonde réflexion. Quel est le rôle de l'Ontario dans cette situation ? Notre province est bien placée pour exercer un véritable leadership auprès de la population anglophone du Canada, et là j'inclus les autres provinces auprès de tous les anglophones à travers le pays. L'Ontario a la plus grande population totale et la plus grande population francophone hors Québec. La province a une économie très diversifiée et très dynamique et elle est située en plein centre du pays. C'est aussi la province qui a le plus à perdre dans l'éventualité de l'éclatement de la Confédération canadienne. Elle doit donner l'exemple aux autres provinces.

Qu'est-ce que cela veut dire concrètement ? L'Ontario doit démontrer sa volonté de relever les communautés francophones et autochtones au rang de partenaires égaux.

Entre autres, elle doit se déclarer officiellement bilingue dans tous les services publics, tant au niveau provincial que municipal ; elle doit compléter le système d'éducation en français, c'est-à-dire au niveau postsecondaire ; elle doit aider financièrement à l'établissement d'un réseau de garderies francophones. Ce ne sont que quelques exemples que je donne entre autres.

Elle doit changer son visage anglophone en y ajoutant la dimension francophone dans la vie quotidienne des gens. Elle doit prendre tous les moyens possibles pour réduire l'assimilation des francophones de 30% à 0.0%. Enfin, elle doit régler les revendications des autochtones de façon juste, équitable et favorable à la préservation de leurs coutumes et de leur mode de vie. En un mot, il faut que les anglophones cessent de penser que le Canada leur appartient à eux tous seuls et qu'ils démontrent qu'ils sont prêts à le partager avec les deux autres communautés nationales.

Dans l'atteinte de cet objectif, il est clair que les médias joueront un rôle prépondérant. Nous savons tous combien les médias forgent l'opinion publique par les images et l'interprétation qu'ils donnent aux événements et aux paroles. J'ai assez souvent l'occasion d'écouter, par exemple, les nouvelles tantôt en français, tantôt en anglais et parfois dans les deux langues le même jour, et vous n'avez pas idée combien l'impression qui me reste est différente selon que j'écoute une nouvelle, un fait, un événement présenté à la télévision française, et le même événement présenté à la télévision anglaise et pourtant c'est le même fait, c'est le même événement. C'est qu'on semble avoir un désir de toujours présenter notre point de vue comme étant le bon, celui à retenir.

Il y a aussi l'autre aspect, il y a des nouvelles, vous savez, il y a des événements qui sont présentés à une télévision ou à l'autre, mais pas aux deux. Je vais vous donner un exemple. Il y a quelques années j'ai vu dans un journal de langue française un petit incident qui m'a scandalisé. C'étaient les forces canadiennes de Petawawa qui avaient traversé la rivière puis qui sont allées au Québec faire une expérience avec des explosifs. Et puis ils avaient comme ça vidé complètement, tué tous les poissons dans un lac au Québec. Vous savez, j'ai cherché et je n'ai pas vu un seul médium anglophone répéter cette nouvelle.

1440

C'est le genre de choses qui nous divisent, qui divisent les Canadiens parce qu'on présente des points de vue qui ne sont pas impartiaux, qui ne sont pas justes et qui fomentent et qui nourrissent la division. Le rôle des médias sera très important.

Je termine là-dessus. Vous croyez peut-être que j'ai brossé un bien sombre tableau de la situation, que la solution que je propose n'est pas réaliste. À cela je répondrais que cette fois, le Québec n'est plus dans une situation de faiblesse vis-à-vis de ses partenaires et que, si les anglophones veulent garder le haut du pavé, les Québécois leur diront tout simplement : «Non, merci». Et je vous remercie.

M. le Président : Merci à vous. Le temps ne nous permet pas de questions. I should have perhaps mentioned this earlier. We would appreciate having the opportunity of

asking questions at the end of the presentation, but because of the time allocated we would therefore ask that people try to limit their presentations to about the 10- or 12-minute mark if you are presenting as an individual and 20 to 25 minutes if you are presenting as part of a group. That will allow us time for questions as well as a bit of time to add speakers who may not have registered with us before. If that is the case, if there are other people who would like to speak to us, if they make that known to any of the people from our staff who are circulating around the hall, we will do our best to accommodate that.

DAVID CYR

The Chair: I call David Cyr.

M. Cyr : Monsieur le Président, membres du comité, le rôle de l'Ontario dans la survie du Canada :

Le Canada connaît présentement une période critique de son histoire. Depuis le début de la Confédération canadienne, les Canadiens ont toujours su maintenir et améliorer leur niveau de vie, mais ils comprennent que dans un monde marqué par la concurrence, seule la stabilité politique et sociale décidera l'avenir du pays.

Le gouvernement fédéral nous disait que l'accord du Lac Meech marquait le début d'un Canada uni. Une fois en vigueur, le Québec aurait pris sa place au sein de la Confédération canadienne tout en étant une société distincte. Le gouvernement fédéral nous disait aussi qu'il y aurait eu une deuxième ronde de négociations sur le partage des droits, cependant, tout a échoué parce que l'un ou l'autre gouvernement ne s'est pas disposé à faire des compromis. A cause de l'échec du Lac Meech, il sera difficile de négocier une nouvelle entente constitutionnelle qui répondra aux besoins de tous. Le Canadien se demande aujourd'hui s'il existe une solution permanente à ce problème.

Il me semble qu'il est trop tard pour mettre au point une nouvelle entente et en pratique, les Canadiens n'y sont pas prêts. Il faut donc trouver une autre solution avec une approche pleinement satisfaisante.

Pendant que la province du Québec se prépare à un référendum, elle cherchera à faire des ententes bilatérales avec le gouvernement fédéral. Il est clair que s'opposer et critiquer les exigences du Québec ne s'avère qu'une perte de temps. L'Ontario devra passer à l'action sans aucun doute.

Ceci m'amène à vous expliquer un exemple peu ordinaire. Je vais essayer de vous expliquer la situation du Québec. Au Québec il y a un cercueil et ça fait longtemps qu'il est là. Dans ce cercueil il y a un vampire souverainiste. Ce vampire est une personne dangereuse, vu hors Québec. En 1980, avant que ce vampire ne se fut poigner par Ottawa, il a eu le temps de passer à 40% de la population. Depuis l'échec du Lac Meech, il y a une personne encore qui est allée voir ce cercueil. On a enlevé ce qui était planté dans le cœur et puis cette personne, ce vampire s'est transformé en chauve-souris et puis aujourd'hui 64% des Québécois ont une morsure souverainiste. La majorité de ces 64% sont les politiciens, les syndicats et le milieu d'affaires.

Il y a quatre façons desquelles on peut éliminer ce mouvement souverainiste, et la bonne méthode n'a jamais

été utilisée. On peut les effrayer, on peut les tirer de l'eau bénite ou on peut leur faire mal, mais ça s'avère une riposte négative. On peut faire la même chose comme on a fait en 1980, leur percer le cœur, d'une façon, mais ceci s'avère aussi une solution temporaire. Par contre, on a tout le temps regardé ces fameux films ; la façon d'éliminer ce vampire est par une source de lumière et puis ce vampire va se désintégrer. Ceci m'amène ici : que l'Ontario peut devenir cette source de lumière.

J'ai mes recommandations ici. Comment renverser le mouvement souverainiste au Québec ? En premier lieu, il est très important de réduire la tension linguistique qui règne dans le pays en déclarant la province de l'Ontario officiellement bilingue. Un coup qui s'est fait, l'Ontario devient une source de lumière pour tous les francophones, pas seulement au Québec, partout dans le monde. L'Ontario ouvre ses portes et prend sa place au sommet de la francophonie, fors j'ai à dire, ouvre ses portes pas seulement encore aux entreprises québécoises, mais partout dans le monde.

Je sais qu'il est très difficile pour les politiciens ici en Ontario de faire face à déclarer la province officiellement bilingue. Vous allez avoir pas mal de pression sur vos épaules. Mais par contre, économiquement, si on sensibilise les compagnies comme on l'a fait au libre-échange — on demandait aux industries : «Est-ce que vous êtes pour ou vous êtes contre ?» Les résultats étaient publiés dans le *Globe and Mail*, pour et contre. Est-ce qu'on peut faire la même chose avec le bilinguisme ? Mais si vous faites ça, c'est vrai que les médias vont dire que vous vous servez de boucliers pour faire face à la population.

En deuxième lieu, sensibiliser la population économiquement et socialement. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario fait face à la population avec le support du milieu des affaires. La deuxième étape serait de promouvoir l'égalité des droits pour tous les citoyens de l'Ontario. Un point important à ça, c'est que l'Ontario devient une province exemplaire. Je vais vous donner un exemple là-dessus. Depuis la crise d'Oka, la télévision nous a montré beaucoup de documentaires sur nos autochtones et même des films, comme *Where the Spirit Lives*. Ces documentaires à la télévision ont sensibilisé les gens. Je crois aujourd'hui qu'il y en a de plus en plus qui sympathisent avec les autochtones.

Je me suis toujours demandé la question : le gouvernement fédéral a eu le courage de compenser les Japonais il n'y a pas longtemps, mais est-ce que les politiciens ont le courage de compenser nos autochtones ici au Canada ? Un coup qui c'est fait : l'Ontario est en position d'influencer et motiver les autres provinces. On parle de leadership là, par voie de commission d'étude, etc.

1450

En troisième lieu, inviter les autres provinces à discuter de la réforme constitutionnelle. Le gouvernement de l'Ontario exerce son leadership. Il va falloir que le gouvernement de l'Ontario atteigne une certaine crédibilité avant qu'elle suggère aux autres provinces quoi faire.

Ma conclusion : l'Ontario a un rôle important à la survie du Canada. Parfois le leader devra se sacrifier afin de

motiver et d'influencer les autres. Il est donc nécessaire que l'Ontario devienne la province exemplaire.

Je vous ai passé un mémoire, mais maintenant je vous passe mon cœur parce que j'ai devant moi ici un salut au drapeau canadien. Il y a plusieurs d'entre vous qui n'ont pas vu ça, ça n'existe pas encore au Canada et puis je vous ai donné des copies. Moi j'y crois fortement : que la fierté canadienne amène l'unité.

Prenons comme exemple, dans deux, trois ou quatre mois d'ici, quand nos soldats canadiens vont revenir du golfe Persique, préparons-nous à reconnaître de nouveaux héros ici, Canadiens. Quand ces soldats vont défiler dans les rues canadiennes ici, les canadiens vont ressentir une fierté qu'ils n'ont que rarement sentie auparavant. Si je reviens avant ça, je crois fortement que si les politiciens à vue des Canadiens se sont serrés la main dans plusieurs domaines, quand je parle de serrer la main, ça veut dire les politiciens qui sont dans l'Opposition et ceux-là qui forment le gouvernement. C'est très électrifant et puis ça montre une fierté.

Mon salut au drapeau du Canadien, et je vous le cite : «À mon drapeau et au pays qu'il représente, je promets respect et fidélité. D'une mer à l'autre, flotte avec fierté et dans tes plis garde-nous toujours unis. Sois pour nous tous un symbole de l'amour, de la liberté et de la justice. Dieu garde notre drapeau. Dieu protège notre Canada».

C'est tout.

M. le Président : Merci. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ?

Mr Offer: Just one question: During your presentation you spoke about the declaration of Ontario as being bilingual and it seemed that what you were doing was stating that this is a question that should be taken to the people of the province. I think in your submission you spoke about that question being taken through the newspapers as a question. I was wondering if you were talking about a referendum at that time.

M. Cyr : Non, une approche plus facile d'aller chercher un genre de bouclier, si je veux dire. Économiquement, je crois que si l'Ontario ouvre ses portes, même si le Québec se sépare, je crois que l'Ontario inviterait des entreprises francophones du Québec, par exemple la Banque Royale et ainsi de suite. En passant à travers ces compagnies, économiquement — je ne parle pas du social — je crois sincèrement qu'avec les résultats que vous allez connaître, si vous parlez peut-être à la chambre de commerce de Toronto, s'ils sont en faveur de ça, il serait plus difficile pour des gens de la population de dire : «Bon, moi je travaille pour cette compagnie-là, et puis cette compagnie-là supporte le bilinguisme». C'est juste pour un genre de méthode de faciliter la tâche d'approcher le public, non pas par un référendum, mais par les étapes que je vous ai mentionnées.

Mais quand je parle de déclarer la province officiellement bilingue, il est sûr qu'il va falloir faire preuve de courage, et puis quand je parle de la deuxième étape, de promouvoir l'égalité de tous les droits des citoyens de l'Ontario, les deux vont ensemble.

L'UNITÉ NIPISSING SECONDAIRE
DE L'ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES
ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

M. le Président : Si je peux maintenant appeler Michel Beaupré.

M. Beaupré : Bonjour, Monsieur le Président. Je vous souhaite la bienvenue à North Bay ainsi qu'à tous les membres du comité spécial. Il me fait plaisir d'être parmi vous aujourd'hui.

Je suis ici non à titre personnel, quoique j'aimerais souligner, tel que l'a indiqué une personne avant moi, je suis moi aussi un Franco-Ontarien de longue date, de plusieurs générations, et je représente aujourd'hui les enseignants dans les écoles secondaires de North Bay, Mattawa et Sturgeon Falls qui oeuvrent en langue française tel qu'indiqué au début de mon mémoire. Nous sommes environ 110 et nous avons le privilège vraiment d'oeuvrer avec la jeunesse franco-ontarienne.

On se rappelle l'expression y a quelques années : «Touching the Future». La profession d'enseignant est celle où on voit l'avenir devant nous et nous avons le plaisir non seulement d'oeuvrer avec nos chefs de demain, mais de partager avec eux leurs inquiétudes et leur vision d'un Canada futur. En fin de compte, c'est la raison pour laquelle je suis ici aujourd'hui. C'est à cause de mon optimisme personnel. C'est dans ma nature, après 20 ans d'enseignement, de toujours demeurer optimiste et aussi d'avoir vu l'idéalisme de nos jeunes Franco-Ontariens dans les écoles secondaires, qui sont tous âgés de 13 à 18 ans, dont plusieurs sont déjà sur le marché du travail et qui eux aussi ont des inquiétudes et des aspirations face à la réalité ontarienne et à la crise constitutionnelle d'aujourd'hui.

Si vous permettez, je vais me référer à la deuxième page de mon bref, où j'indique que la crise d'identité du Franco-Ontarien est de longue date. Certains de mes prédécesseurs ici aujourd'hui y ont fait allusion. Évidemment les jeunes en pleine adolescence vivent déjà une crise d'identité au niveau personnel, au niveau familial, au niveau de leur école et de leur travail. Je me pose la question : qu'est-ce qu'un francophone dans l'Ontario de 1991 ? L'éducateur qui se dit francophone et qui vit cette réalité pluraliste qui est l'Ontario d'aujourd'hui, peut-il identifier sa population étudiante et peut-il s'identifier lui-même aux espoirs dans l'avenir que cette jeunesse représente ?

Il m'est venu l'idée de résumer des termes par lesquels le Franco-Ontarien s'identifie, et j'ai fait un résumé très bref ici de la conquête et certains ont fait référence à ça tout à l'heure. Ils sont plus connaisseurs en histoire et plus sages que moi à ce niveau. À la conquête, on s'appelait les Canadiens, on était un Canadien. À l'union des deux Canada en 1840 ainsi qu'à la Confédération en 1867 nous sommes devenus Canadiens français. En 1967, lors du centenaire, et on vivait à ce moment-là aussi une crise qui a culminé dans la crise d'octobre 70, nous sommes devenus des francophones hors Québec, un nouveau terme avec une nouvelle dimension. On se définissait par rapport au fait qu'on était à l'extérieur du Québec. En 1975 nous avons eu le drapeau franco-ontarien. En 1976 et l'élection du Parti québécois au Québec, nous sommes devenus

Franco-Ontariens officiellement avec un drapeau pour le prouver. En 1986, avec l'adoption de la Loi 8, nous sommes devenus Ontariens.

Donc, la question que je me pose et certains jeunes dans nos écoles se posent la même question : quelle est la définition concluante de ce que c'est qu'un Franco-Ontarien ? Nous avons tous vécu des déchiements personnels, des situations familiales où un membre de la famille ne peut plus converser en langue française. Cette personne est encore très proche de nous mais n'a plus la langue maternelle ni la facilité de s'exprimer dans cette langue.

1500

Comme enseignants nous avons un double mandat. Nous avons le mandat non seulement d'écouter ce que les jeunes ont à dire, mais aussi de leur aider à avoir un modèle positif pour l'avenir. La citation que j'ai ici au bas de la page 2 de mon mémoire :

«L'on enseigne pas ce que l'on sait ou ce que l'on croit savoir : on n'enseigne et on ne peut enseigner que ce que l'on est».

Si vous permettez, je vais sauter la troisième page qui est une référence à des statistiques que vous connaissez sans doute déjà sur les réalités franco-ontariennes dans le district de Nipissing. Le point intéressant au bas de cette page quand même est que la population francophone de Nipissing est répartie de façon très inégale. Sachant que je représente les enseignants dans les écoles des trois différentes communautés qui sont aussi les trois principales communautés urbaines de la région de Nipissing, il est bon de remarquer qu'à North Bay, la population francophone représente 14,8% de la population globale, tandis qu'à Sturgeon Falls ce pourcentage francophone est d'environ 72% et à Mattawa le même pourcentage baisse à 47%.

Le seul fait remarquable, en plus du fait que ces pourcentages sont plus élevés que les moyennes en province, c'est qu'il y a seulement un médium de communication francophone dans toute la région et c'est un hebdomadaire bilingue à Sturgeon Falls. Voilà les réalités avec lesquelles nos jeunes ont à communiquer lorsqu'ils veulent se parler l'un à l'autre.

Je fais référence ensuite à l'assimilation ou l'intégration. Il y a un excellent volume qui a été publié en 1990 qui fait une étude scientifique et sociologique des aspirations des jeunes Franco-Ontariens. Cette étude, qui est citée ici, s'appelle l'Ambition démesurée, «ambition» parce que tous nos jeunes, de toute langue et de toute nationalité ici en Ontario partagent des aspirations semblables ; «démesurée» parce que dans le cas du jeune Franco-Ontarien, il n'a pas toujours les outils ni la facilité pour oeuvrer dans sa langue maternelle à tous les niveaux. J'indique ici une citation. «L'étudiant et l'étudiante apprennent que leur monde est anglais et reproduisent cet apprentissage ; 67,3 % d'entre eux estiment, à un degré ou à un autre, que «le français est une langue qu'on parle principalement à la maison». La vie, partout en dehors du foyer, pour un nombre important de personnes, a perdu sa dimension francophone».

J'oserais dire que ceci représente une réalité non seulement dans le nord-est de l'Ontario, où l'étude a été princi-

pablement faite, mais de même pour d'autres secteurs de la province.

William Davis a mentionné en 1968 que fondamentalement, la préservation d'une langue et d'une culture se fait par le système d'éducation. En tant qu'éducateurs, nous avons encore là un rôle important à jouer.

Je fais ensuite référence au fait que comme Franco-Ontariens, nous avons, c'est vrai, certains droits collectifs, que l'Assemblée législative a cru bon en 1986 d'indiquer sous la forme de la Loi 8, qui a connu par après certaines difficultés en province. La difficulté principale que je voyais là-dedans, c'était le fait que dans notre système de droit et certainement dans la jurisprudence anglaise, on voit qu'il y a une priorité toute spéciale accordée aux libertés individuelles. Moi, j'en suis un qui crois fermement à ces libertés.

Par ailleurs, nous comme francophones espérons avoir des services ainsi que des possibilités d'oeuvrer dans notre langue et des garantis, par le législateur, que ces services nous seront non seulement accessibles, mais sur une base d'égalité. Maintenant, l'égalité pour un groupe minoritaire peut vouloir dire complètement un autre concept que l'égalité dans la jurisprudence ou pour le législateur parce qu'on regarde à ce moment-là des formes d'action positive.

La législation permet d'aller de l'avant et d'encourager certains groupes qui ont été désavantagés dans le passé d'obtenir des services du gouvernement qui n'étaient pas accessibles à eux auparavant. Un des meilleurs exemples de ça est l'article 15 de la Charte des droits et libertés de 1982.

En somme, ce que j'essaie de dire ici est que le Franco-Ontarien est très respectueux des libertés individuelles mais veut à la fois des garanties juridiques que seul un Parlement ou une Assemblée législative peut lui donner. Les protections collectives que nous avons à l'article 23 de la Charte des droits sont un excellent exemple du mariage des deux concepts : la liberté individuelle ainsi que la gestion de nos écoles de langue française partout en province.

La dernière page, avant les recommandations, fait simplement souligner un fait qui a été mentionné par plusieurs ici aujourd'hui, que l'Ontario a toujours été dans une position privilégiée pour entretenir une dualité linguistique, pour reconnaître aussi ses liens économiques avec le Québec qui sont à la base de l'Acte d'Union de 1840 ainsi que la Confédération, et qui a mené après 1867 à l'annexion des régions économiques tributaires.

La question posée tout à l'heure et que je répète ici : quel genre de partenariat l'Ontario est-il prêt à négocier avec le Québec et où se situent les minorités franco-ontariennes dans cet échiquier politique ? Quelles garanties auront les minorités dans les provinces si le pouvoir central du Parlement est restreint par des concessions aux intérêts régionaux ?

Donc, à la fin, j'ai quatre recommandations auxquelles j'aimerais faire allusion rapidement :

1. Que le gouvernement de l'Ontario assure la promotion de la tolérance et du respect des minorités raciales, culturelles et linguistiques par l'entremise de programmes d'éducation à tous les paliers d'enseignement et d'en assurer le financement ;

2. Que le gouvernement de l'Ontario continue d'assurer un plus grand accès, aux minorités linguistiques de l'Ontario et en particulier à la minorité francophone, à tous les services gouvernementaux subventionnés par la province. J'ose ajouter que ceci inclut des services municipaux ;

3. Que le gouvernement de l'Ontario facilite la mise sur pied d'institutions scolaires gérées par et pour les francophones à tous les niveaux d'éducation tout en assurant une base équitable de ressources nécessaires à leur viabilité ;

4. Que le gouvernement de l'Ontario considère les avantages de créer un organisme permanent de consultation avec ses citoyens qui aurait comme mandat de circuler en province, ainsi que de faire rapport à l'Assemblée législative sur la mise en vigueur des recommandations des comités spéciaux et des commissions ad hoc.

En d'autres mots, je veux vous garantir un emploi pour un certain temps à venir, mais surtout m'assurer que la consultation soit réelle. Je vous en remercie parce que je crois que c'est un exercice très important dans une démocratie que vous, les membres de l'Assemblée législative, nous donnez l'occasion de partager nos inquiétudes avec vous ; surtout, et la recommandation 4 le vise, que vous soyez prêts à écouter et à agir sur ces recommandations. Je vous en remercie.

M. le Président : Merci à vous, Monsieur Beaupré. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ? Any questions?

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Merci, Monsieur Beaupré. I am very impressed with your brief. We have had very few educators come before us, and certainly a secondary school teacher operating and coming before us in an official way does have a significance. I want to ask you, first of all, if you have looked at *Changement et renouveau*, this document, as a *fédération-association* or with your students?

M. Beaupré : Oui, je peux vous répondre. J'ai reçu une copie il y a deux jours, mais je n'ai pas eu l'occasion de la lire, en toute sincérité.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I am very impressed with the way in which you talk in your brief about your students, your role with students, their idealism and their being the inheritors of what we are going to be doing now. I am intrigued by your last recommendation. I also had never seen the chronology of the labels that francophones in Ontario have had to absorb and I do think there is something significant about that unfolding.

1510

I am very, very happy with the sensitivity with which you describe a teacher, and what a teacher is is what a teacher teaches. You very seldom hear this, certainly from a formal group such as yours. I really do hope, in your unique position in this part of the province and the unique position you have with students and young people, that you will take the document and encourage the 110 teachers, or some of them at least, to respond through their classes or themselves to us, because that would be the beginning of your fourth recommendation taking place in its often-called multiplier capacity.

The Chair : I certainly echo that suggestion, Mrs O'Neill.

Mr Harnick: Sir, in your opinion, is Bill 8 an adequate protection for the preservation of the French language and culture? Can Bill 8 be improved upon, or should Ontario be moving towards official bilingualism?

M. Beaupré : Oui, je crois que seulement une pièce de législation, c'est-à-dire la Loi 8 par elle-même, ne suffirait pas à répondre à toutes les attentes des Franco-Ontariens. Il n'y pas de doute que la Loi 8 aurait pu être améliorée autant dans son contenu que dans sa présentation au public de l'Ontario et à l'explication qui aurait pu être donnée sur la rationale pour cette législation. Mais je crois qu'essentiellement le Franco-Ontarien ne s'attend pas à une solution-miracle. On ne peut pas espérer qu'une législation quelconque réponde à tous nos besoins. J'ose espérer que les membres du comité pourront étudier la possibilité d'améliorer la Loi 8, d'en expliquer certainement le contenu à toutes les régions de la province où la Loi 8 est en vigueur, c'est-à-dire les régions désignées et d'assurer, par ailleurs, qu'il y a vraiment une consultation sur les besoins d'améliorer la Loi 8 là où l'Assemblée législative le croit nécessaire. J'espère avoir répondu à votre question.

BERNARD M. WATSON

The Chair: I call next Bernard Watson.

Mr Watson: First of all, as the people have done before me, I would like to thank the committee for giving individuals as well as organizations the chance to express their opinions. I should warn you that I am waging the mother of all battles with the flu. If my voice starts to crack, it is not due to puberty; it is simply the flu. You can thank my students for that. They told me that all day.

Bon anglophone né de mère irlandaise et de père anglais, j'ai pourtant décidé de faire cette présentation en français pour deux raisons majeures.

Dans un premier temps, je voulais que les membres de la commission constatent que les propos francophones que vous avez eus à entendre et que vous aurez peut-être à entendre encore lors de vos audiences publiques ne représentent à mon avis en rien la majorité silencieuse des anglos en Ontario, qu'il existe dans la province bon nombre de citoyens anglos qui sont fort sympathiques au dilemme des Franco-Ontariens.

Deuxièmement, je voulais témoigner que plus on côtoie une ethnie qui n'est pas la nôtre — comme je le fais dans mon emploi depuis plusieurs années — plus on risque d'apprécier leur culture et comprendre leurs aspirations, leurs problèmes. Je ne vous révèle rien de nouveau en vous affirmant que le Canada que nous avons connu jusqu'à présent est bel et bien mort. Pour beaucoup de gens c'est une triste réalité que la structure politique de notre nation doive subir des changements majeurs et que chaque province devra faire des choix assez pénibles.

Sans doute, une des tâches les plus onéreuses du comité sera de faire constater à la population ontarienne que le statu quo, si réconfortant soit-il, n'est plus viable. Espérons que le message sera clair. Acceptons la nouvelle réalité ou plutôt modelons cette nouvelle réalité de façon à ce qu'elle assure un avenir et non seulement des regrets pour le passé. Depuis plus de 100 ans, l'Ontario joue un rôle

majeur lors des débats nationaux. Pensons entre autres au colloque *Confederation of Tomorrow* de John Robarts dans les années 60, au rôle de M. Peterson lors des conférences sur l'entente du Lac Meech. Il faudrait que le gouvernement ne rate pas une nouvelle occasion d'exercer son leadership au niveau national et que nos propos constituent un modèle pour le reste du pays. Mais qu'est-ce qu'on doit envisager pour un Canada nouveau, pour un Canada de l'avenir?

Je vous propose un concept souvent décrit dans le passé par d'autres et je ne me rendais pas compte à quel point ce serait souvent décrit, j'ai l'impression que c'est tout simplement un pâle écho de ce que d'autres ont dit très éloquemment. Mais ça me paraît réalisable quand même, pourvu que la bonne foi y règne. Ce pays idéal, ce serait un endroit où le respect des regroupements linguistiques ne dépendrait plus de la bonne volonté de la population ou d'un parti politique, mais serait plutôt enchâssée dans une constitution et sans possibilité d'abrogation. Avouons que c'est loin d'être de ce que nous avons actuellement.

Au Québec, les anglophones doivent tolérer une loi à mon avis humiliante qui limite officiellement l'usage de leur langue. En Ontario, les francophones doivent quotidiennement affronter des attitudes hostiles de groupes de pression antédiluviens, qui exigent soit l'assimilation totale des francos ou bien la réduction du français, un élément purement folklorique de la province. Ils ne semblent comprendre en rien que la francophonie est un élément fondateur de notre province, ne réclame pas de privilèges, mais plutôt des droits qui lui sont moralement dus.

Je devrais aussi faire une parenthèse ici et mentionner que, avec la Loi 8, il y a certains droits qui sont acquis. Il faudrait peut-être faire un effort pour assurer que ces droits soient respectés au sein des services du gouvernement. Il me semble qu'en insistant que les droits linguistiques soient enchâssés dans une constitution réformée, en déclarant en Ontario que ces droits ne peuvent pas être abrogés, l'Ontario servirait de modèle pour les autres et contribuerait à l'établissement d'une sécurité sociale pour sa minorité.

La justice, cependant, doit être offerte à tous. Il y a un élément de notre société à qui les gouvernements et la population ont nié justice depuis bien trop longtemps. Il s'agit bien sûr des autochtones, un peu par négligence, un peu inconsciemment mais probablement sans mauvaises intentions.

Nous avons mis au rancart des revendications légitimes des premiers citoyens de notre nation et de notre province. Nous avons eu à vivre une crise Oka pour nous sensibiliser à leurs problèmes et pour que leur cause soit popularisée. Dans une nouvelle société ontarienne, il faudrait lui faire la place qui lui revient en respectant ses droits territoriaux. De plus, il faudra assurer un respect de leurs aspirations culturelles en leur fournissant l'autonomie nécessaire au développement des instruments propices à l'épanouissement de leurs traditions. Il me semble que toute mesure inférieure à ceci constituerait un rejet de revendications.

Parce que nous avons la maturité politique pour poser de tels gestes malgré les grognements des dinausures qui se sont fait entendre l'an passé après l'adoption de la

Loi 8, malgré les discours colériques que vous pourrez peut-être entendre, je crois que la vaste majorité des Ontariens est prête à relever le défi, de créer un avenir plus juste où les peuples fondateurs pourront se rencontrer d'égal en égal et se respecter. Pour ce faire, cependant, il faudrait détruire certains mythes qui créent des obstacles à une saine relation entre les peuples fondateurs.

Comme premier mythe nous entendons souvent : «Le français coûte trop cher». Les partisans de cette doctrine me paraissent quelque peu inconstants dans le raisonnement. Il y a un an de telles personnes réclamaient la restauration du service de Via Rail, affirmant avec raison que c'était un facteur qui unifiait le pays même si ce n'était pas économiquement profitable. Il y a trois mois, de telles personnes exigeaient la réouverture des postes de télévision du CBC à partout au Canada en insistant encore une fois que la télévision était importante pour l'unité nationale, même si ça coûtait très cher. Encore une fois, cette logique me paraît impeccable.

Je leur donne raison en ceci : même si certaines choses ne sont pas économiquement rentables, elles en valent la peine pour le bien du pays. Je souhaiterais donc que ce même argument s'applique au respect des droits linguistiques en Ontario. Il y a un prix financier à payer pour maintenir l'unité de notre pays. Si Via Rail et le CBC en valent la peine, combien plus ça vaut la peine de contribuer à unifier une nation en assurant le droit de ses minorités.

1520

Un deuxième mythe : pour avoir un emploi, il faut être francophone ou du moins bilingue. Il suffit de demander un service en français à n'importe quel bureau des gouvernements fédéral ou provincial pour constater qu'une telle affirmation est absolument fausse. Dans la majorité de ces endroits, on est bien chanceux de pouvoir communiquer en français avec plus d'un employé.

D'ailleurs, quel gouvernement serait assez sot pour léser les droits de la majorité pour satisfaire à sa minorité ? En général, les politiciens n'ont pas de tendances suicidaires.

Mythe numéro trois : on veut forcer tout le monde à parler français. Ce dernier mythe repose sur une théorie de conspiration et veut que le gouvernement ait un agenda caché pour transformer tous les citoyens en petits Montréalais ou Parisiens, fumeurs de Gauloises, coiffés de bérets. Comment contrecarrer de telles affirmations ? Peut-être que le meilleur argument est de démontrer que ce sont plutôt les francophones qui ont tendance à être forcés à parler l'anglais et à perdre leur culture plutôt que vice versa. Les études démographiques portant sur l'assimilation des Franco-Ontariens, à Nipissing entre autres, en constituent une triste preuve.

La structure politique et sociale du Canada actuelle, si rassurante soit-elle, est appelée à changer. Il faudrait que l'Ontario se prononce clairement pour assurer que le pays reste tout de même uni. Un facteur qui contribuerait à un Canada plus stable serait une déclaration ferme et qui garantirait aux minorités linguistiques leurs droits de façon inaltérable.

Il est évident que certains citoyens s'y opposeraient par désir de conserver le statu quo, mais à la longue je suis convaincu que le respect mutuel pour les droits des peuples

fondateurs est la clé à la survivance de notre nation. Je vous remercie. Amen.

M. le Président : Merci. Il y a des questions ?

M. Bisson : Oui. Dans votre mémoire, vous avez fait un commentaire que j'ai trouvé un peu intéressant. Il y a pas de numéro sur les pages, je pense que c'est à la deuxième page. Où est-ce que j'ai vu ça ? Excusez-moi, je suis à la mauvaise page.

M. Watson : C'est pas grave.

M. Bisson : Il faut que je me retrouve. Donnez-moi une seconde. Vous avez dit que, si je me rappelle de la manière que je l'avais lu, on ne peut pas laisser le droit des citoyens au goodwill du monde. On a besoin de faire des lois pour protéger. Voulez-vous expliquer ça un peu plus, s'il vous plaît ?

M. Watson : Oui. Je dois vous dire que je viens d'Ottawa et puis quand je demeurais à Ottawa, je trouvais que les francophones étaient plutôt, excusez l'expression, presque paranoïaques, dans le sens qu'ils avaient la vie dure. C'est seulement quand je suis arrivé à North Bay où ils sont une vraie minorité que j'ai constaté qu'ils n'ont pas la vie si facile que ça. Si je peux vous donner un exemple, M. Beer, peut-être, serait au courant. Il avait reçu des communications à cet égard.

Un des mes élèves — puisque je suis professeur — est allé passer son test pour son permis de conduire. Il a essayé de le faire en français. On lui a répondu, «Non, non, tu ne peux pas le passer en français». Il a insisté une deuxième fois, mais on lui a dit : «Non, absolument, tu ne peux pas le passer en français. Tu va échouer si tu le passes en français».

Finalement, ce pauvre bonhomme-là était assujéti à la bonne volonté des personnes qui étaient là. Dans un deuxième temps, j'entends par ça aussi qu'une loi politique peut tout simplement être abrogée. Ce que je prône, c'est une loi où il n'y aura pas de clause «nonobstant», pas de notwithstanding clause. Que ce soit encaissé dans une constitution et qu'on dise que c'est un droit pas un privilège, on ne peut pas vous l'enlever.

M. Beer : Merci pour la présentation que vous venez de nous faire. Je pense que ça peut être intéressant pour nous autres si vous pouviez nous décrire comment vous voyez les relations entre francophones de ce temps-ci dans cette région. On nous parle des fois des problèmes causés soit par la Loi 8 ou simplement des questions de bilinguisme. Est-ce que vous pensez que, avec toute cette discussion durant trois, quatre, cinq dernières années, les deux groupes s'entendent mieux ? Est-ce qu'il y a plus de tension ? Qu'est-ce que vous pensez ?

M. Watson : C'est une question intéressante. J'ai la chance de côtoyer mon ethnie, qui est l'anglais, aussi le regroupement français. Chez la communauté francophone, évidemment elle a été très contente avec la Loi 8. Du côté anglophone, c'est un peu bizarre, il y a eu un ajustement à faire. Je comprends l'ajustement parce que je suis une personne de nature très conservatrice, pas nécessairement dans le sens politique, mais dans le sens travail. Mais dans ma famille, entre autres, où on trouvait la Loi 8 un peu dure, c'est question plus ou moins acceptée. Puis je ne

veux pas insulter ma génération à moi non plus, mais il y a quelque chose de bizarre là-dedans. C'est que plus on parle à la jeunesse, plus on se rend compte que : «It's no big deal», alors que chez les aînés c'est moins facile. Je suis le plus jeune de la famille et je trouve tout ça naturel ; avec mes frères et mes sœurs ou certains d'entre eux, c'est tout un renversement pour eux et j'ose croire que ça se reflète dans la société. La jeunesse l'accepte très facilement.

M. Winninger : Vous avez dit que'en général les politiciens n'ont pas de tendances suicidaires. Je crois que, si on n'aura pas de succès avec cet exercice constitutionnel, peut-être que les tendances suicidaires augmenteront.

M. Watson : En effet, vous êtes assuré qu'en écoutant tout le monde, ce n'est pas le suicide politique, c'est un atout de votre côté.

RON LAMB

The Chair: I will call next Ron Lamb.

Mr Lamb: I would like to thank the committee for taking the time to hear from single Ontarians. I may be of a dissenting belief from some of the people who spoke before me, but I feel it is also necessary for the committee to hear where 26% of Canadians are coming from.

I am going to talk along the idea of the eight areas that you are questioning, and the first is, what are the values we share as Canadians?

We believe the government is elected by the people, for the people and of the people. We believe that all people are entitled to their own religion, culture, language and the pursuit of their own monetary wellbeing at their labour's earn. We believe in the care of the less fortunate, the seniors and the oppressed. We believe that all are equal: men, women and children. We believe that we do not want to poison the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land we grow our food on. We believe in our justice system, that all are equal, and in the right to a fair hearing from our peers.

Increasingly, what we are seeing is government at all levels doing what it thinks is best for the people instead of what the people tell the government to do. Examples are as follows: Mr Peterson giving up Ontario Senate seats without having a mandate to even propose such a negotiating chip from the people who elected him to Queen's Park; the free trade deal with Mexico that would have to be signed before the present federal government has to go to the people to get a mandate; the involvement of offensive weapons in the Gulf war, which Mr Mulroney does not have a mandate from the Canadians to be involved in. This is increasingly more embarrassing to us as we travel throughout the world. The people we have met have always considered Canadians as peacekeepers and peace-makers. We should have only sent hospitals and medical personnel to the war zone on humanitarian grounds.

As an aside, this morning I was watching Newsworld and there were a thousand people killed by one bomb in a bomb shelter. Those thousand people were young women and young children.

We as Canadians value our politicians only as long as the politicians do as directed by our democratic system. Please, no more hidden agendas.

1530

How can we secure our future in an international economy? We can secure our future in an international economy by being more creative in the sciences, physics, mathematics and electronic engineering. Also, we have to develop good marketing skills and products created in extremely tight quality control requirements. We can secure our future in an international economy by being competitively priced, by being efficient and by developing our own huge natural resources.

We can secure our future in an international economy by not tying the hands of our manufacturers by insisting that in our own markets every product has to be in two languages. The increased cost for research, production and quality control place tremendous burdens on our manufacturers, which does not leave sufficient leverage on the bottom line to increase expenditures in research and development. All one has to do is look at the Japanese market to learn one very important fact: the Japanese do not require the manufacturers to label all products in two languages for their home market. Let the marketplace decide which products have to be labelled in what languages.

What role should the federal and provincial governments play? The federal government should be making contacts at the first level of trade such as Ottawa-Moscow, Ottawa-Peking, Ottawa-Paris. The provincial government should be making contacts between Queen's Park and the Po Valley region of Italy, or Queen's Park and Lithuania. Both the federal and provincial governments should then allow the business sectors to make contacts on a business-to-business basis.

With increased markets opening and new products entering these markets, the provincial government should be bringing the educational training levels up beyond any we have seen to this point. We have to have a better-funded apprenticeship system.

One point we cannot make too strongly is that the provincial government has to stop allowing our agricultural lands to be paved, concreted and grassed over. In Canada, we do not have enough agricultural land to truck-farm, grow apples, pears and like crops, and they allow the rape of our farm land to continue. Above all things, we have to be able to feed ourselves. Increasingly, we are becoming dependent on offshore imports.

The areas that could be developed for manufacturing, homes for employees to live in, plants to build products for sale, are experiencing high unemployment levels and low wages. Provincial governments have to take the lead in developing land that will allow manufacturers to put plants in outlying areas. The Golden Horseshoe is just about big enough.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? We achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples by giving these people self-government after giving them the tools and knowledge to be successful. This requires the withdrawal of the bureaucracy from the day-to-day running of programs and allowing the aboriginal

peoples to take over. The lands the aboriginal people own which there are no treaties signed for remain for ever the property of the aboriginal peoples.

What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada? In any democracy, the representation of any ethnic part of that democracy is reflected in the percentage that ethnic part is of the whole. Twenty-six or an even higher percentage of Canadians do not believe in bilingualism. Francophones represent 33% of the population of Canada; 25% of the francophone population lives in Quebec. That leaves 6%-8% of the francophone population living in other areas of Canada, yet the present situation as it stands is that 33% of the total population represents 50% of the total resources of Canadian printing, manufacturing, immersion schools, pupils taking French in schools, in the other 67% of the country. It is an idealistic Walden Two to believe that we as a country can continue to afford the luxury of bilingualism in this country from sea to sea to sea.

We are, at the federal level, a bankrupt country. We have to start paring down Quebec's dream of a new France. The business of war—right now in the Gulf, they are speaking English when they fight the war. Airline industry: traffic controllers, worldwide, English; you can fly into Peking. Shipping laws, British shipping laws are in English. Most of the financial sectors, on a world scale, use English as a common working language.

Students in China, a billion plus; India, 750 million getting on to a billion; Russia, closing in on 300 million; our new one—we should all start learning how to speak Spanish from the looks of it—is Mexico, getting between 65 million and 85 million. They all have English as a second language taught in their places of learning. The above are only a few of the countries worldwide that teach English as a second language.

What is Quebec's future in Canada? We as a society believe that if the quebecois stay on the course they are following, there is no future for Quebec in Canada. Even under the present demands from the committee in Quebec, the province of Quebec ceases to exist and the country of Quebec emerges.

We in the rest of Canada, the other 70% of Canadians, have been accused of not understanding Quebec's wants and needs. We believe we do understand what Quebec wants, that is, Quebec wants to be become as free as an adolescent child, would like to attain self-direction but have the parents pay for the rent, use their currency, and entice some of the brightest siblings with them.

We also believe that Quebec should leave Canada as quickly and as quietly as possible. This may sound like tough love, but sometimes we feel that is necessary. The FLQ tried to tell us a long time ago, and as an angry parent we quashed the hopes of this young baby. Now the baby has become a young adult, and it is time for it to try its freedom on its own.

We also strongly believe that when this happens, Quebec should be treated as any other foreign country. For example, citizens from the country of Quebec would require a passport to travel to other areas of Canada. Citizens from Quebec would have to float their own currency and

central banking system, without Canadian participation. Quebec would be responsible for its own defense internally and externally. All Quebec citizens would be required to obtain a work permit to secure employment in the rest of Canada, as other Canadians are required now to work in Quebec. Quebec would leave Canada with the same provincial boundaries it came into Confederation with.

What is the place of the west, north and Atlantic region? The place of western Canada is that each western province has equal representation in the running of Canada as Ontario. The place of the north in Canada is that the Yukon becomes a province, the Northwest Territories become four provinces, and we start to develop these areas now. The place of the Atlantic region in Canada is that it joins in a regional financial understanding, and the equalization payments that were going to Quebec would go to these provinces to help their development. Also, each province in the Atlantic group region would become an equal partner in Confederation. As the west is equal to Ontario, the east is equal to the west.

What does Ontario want? We believe Ontario wants an end to spending on bilingualism, multiculturalism and overtaking. We propose that with the savings introduced by ending provincial funding to bilingualism and multiculturalism there would be funding free to help with getting the homeless homes, jobs and affordable housing, an end to food banks and food kitchens, a reduced cost of living with the lowering of taxes so people have money to spend on goods and services so full employment is attained.

1540

The other things people in Ontario would like to see: that the Prime Minister of Canada be a born Canadian; that the Senate be elected and equal to the powers of the Commons; that there be a mechanism placed in the Constitution for the impeachment of the Prime Minister, cabinet and premiers; that all votes in both Houses at the federal level and also all votes in the provincial governments be free votes. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lamb. There are a couple of questions. We may not be able to get through them all, but we will try.

Mr Harnick: You have provided us with a very comprehensive plan for the future, but you have neglected one very significant aspect: What would happen to the \$30-billion worth of trade that takes place annually between Quebec and Ontario? When that trade is lost, where will it be made up? Where will the people whose jobs are lost find work? That is going to be a significant dent in the economy of Ontario. Why have you not provided for that?

Mr Lamb: If you notice, I did not say we curtail trade.

Mr Harnick: So you want to do everything else, put up all these barriers, but you think the trade will just continue. It is that simple, I gather.

Mr Lamb: No. I think you have to look at it from this point: we have that situation, really, with free trade and the rest of it with the United States in a lot of ways. Right now, I do not have a feeling that we would put trade barriers

ers up against Quebec. Whether the new country of Quebec would want that is up to itself. It is a two-way street.

Mr Harnick: Do you not think that the cost of whatever we pay for bilingualism and respecting another culture is a small price to pay when you consider that you are putting \$30-billion worth of annual business in jeopardy? Do you not think that one more than offsets the other?

Mr Lamb: I think you think the way most do in that. I think dollars will find their own way across whatever borders. There are no borders for a dollar. If somebody is going to make money in Ontario, he will make the money regardless of the culture. If somebody wants to make money in Quebec, regardless of the culture of Quebec, he is going to make money. We see that with Bombardier. We buy light transit from Bombardier, or even in Taiwan and other places in the world. I do not think it is because they are French that they are buying those Bombardier systems.

Mr Harnick: You have not answered my question.

Mr Lamb: I believe I have.

The Chair: Let's leave it at that. Mr Beer, a quick question, and a quick answer, please.

Mr Beer: One of the points I sensed in your whole presentation was how the political process functions and how it responds to what, in your view, would be perhaps certain approaches you think governments, be they provincial or federal, have not followed. I think there is a feeling out there—it has come forward in a number of presentations—about: What changes do we make to the political system?

Let me give you a specific example, and if you would respond. I have now gone through two provincial elections and in each of those the question of bilingualism in Bill 8, while not a major issue, none the less was there. And in each of those elections, in 1987 and 1990, not just in my own party but other members of the Legislature, those who have returned have supported the principle of that bill.

When I try to determine what it is that people think or how I as a legislator should act, it seems to me that I can look at that issue and say there are people who do not like the bilingualism program but there would appear to be a sense throughout the province that in principle—we are not talking here about exactly how it is administered, because there can be mistakes made there—in principle people approve.

Is it your sense that somehow there are issues now where the every three or four years we have elections—some of us, perhaps, would prefer the four-year phase—is not sufficient to determine what it is that people want or how we as legislators interact with electors? Because it seems to me that we have a real problem here; you are not going to elect somebody who just pushes a button after taking a poll in his riding, but you want an elected person to be thinking and trying to weigh and bring some sort of reason. It seems to me that at the base of a lot of the concerns out there today is this link, and I would be interested in your thoughts on that.

Mr Lamb: It sounds like I am down on you all. In a lot of cases people are doing a fine job. I really do admire you. I know it is long hours and hard work and not a lot of

thanks. Where I would like to see the situation—I think Mr Eves spoke to it earlier—is that if we are going to have bilingualism, let's have a referendum. I do not think it is something you as legislators can answer, I really do not. I think you are getting mixed—I can load a committee room too. I could load one of the rooms where you are giving an election speech.

I understand where those people are coming from, but I think something as serious as that—I was in the manufacturing field, and I kept wondering. Something as little as a bottle of Aspirin—that is in your backyard; I live in your backyard—in manufacturing a bottle of Aspirin the costs were 32% more in Canada just for the case because of the double printing, the double labelling; 32% more represented that cost. In our case, because it has to be so precise, being a medication, it has to be right on. You cannot have a smear on it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lamb.

C. J. TOYE

Mr Toye: I am speaking as an ordinary citizen, not representing anyone. As far as I am concerned, you are catering more to Quebec. We are entirely wrong. We have been flogging a dead horse for 45 years. They have marched to a different drummer from the rest of Canada in all that time, and no matter what we offer them today they are going to ask for something different tomorrow. I think we had just as well let them go and give them our best wishes. That is about all I have to say.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Have you been to Ottawa lately, or have you ever lived in what we call the nation's capital?

Mr Toye: No. I was born there, but I have never lived there.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I have a great deal of difficulty with the thought that there are not natural ties with the real people. I know what you say about the politics, because the politics in some cases has been very difficult. That is one of the difficulties I am having with some of the messages I am getting out of Quebec right now. I think it is politics; I do not think a lot of it is some people's lives.

I live and represent one of the ridings in Ottawa, and when I hear the phrases, "Let them go," or, "We need a passport," I think about the 50,000 people who cross those bridges every day, and I think about the kinds of co-operative efforts we are getting in the community I represent, the kind of natural behaviour that goes on with such things as Via Rail and Rapidaire, which travel this boundary two, three, four times a day and in some cases once every hour.

So I personally have a lot of difficulty when you say that the people I live with and with whom I celebrated Winterlude last Friday night are marching to a different drummer, because we were all together. Winterlude, which is our celebration of winter, is celebrated on both sides of the river, and it is truly a celebration. I really hope we will hear—as you know, we are trying not to be reactive to Quebec; we are trying to be proactive on this committee. At this point we have not even got the real recommendations of the Liberal Party, nor do we have the recommendations of the other committee.

So I think we should try and be 1991. I think we all realize we are at some kind of very serious decision point, but I hope that you will try and have a little bit more hopefulness that maybe somebody can come with some small step and that we will not continue to at least be perceived as marching to a different tune, because the real people who live in those communities that have very, very close boundaries to each other really have some very good signs that things can happen and that we can grow together. I for one on this committee want to encourage as much as I can that we continue to talk. If we do not reach a solution, that is another thing, but we can continue to talk.

1550

The Chair: Mr Toye, before you respond, I have been asked to ask if you could remove the headset because the translation is coming through apparently on to the microphone and it is affecting the sound going out.

Mr Toye: Speaking of politics, I hope you do not do the same thing the federal government did on the free trade deal. Everyone should have a say for what we are going to do. Everyone should have a plebiscite on it.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Well, I thank you for coming before us because we really are very happy that the response we have had to this committee is all ages, all parts of the community and that is going to be helpful to us.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ARTHUR DAVIS

The Chair: Could I call Arthur Davis.

Mr Davis: In my view, the new Constitution should recognize and embody a principle of sovereignty for the first nations. Naturally, the first nations should be consulted about how they wish to be sovereign. The province of Ontario has shown the way to deal with the first nations by defending them and urging that their land claims be settled. The convention resolution of 1988 is the one that I wish to refer to.

"Whereas there exist in Ontario sovereign Indian nations which have the right as aboriginal peoples to be dealt with justly by Canadian society; whereas this can only be done through the recognition of the Indians' right to control their own affairs; whereas the Indian peoples have entered into treaties and agreements with the crown; but whereas these agreements were made often without the Indians' full understanding and acceptance of the terms of these agreements; and whereas the governments have not respected the terms and spirit of these agreements; therefore, be it resolved that the Canadian government should recognize and respect the Indians' aboriginal and treaty rights. These rights include but are not limited to the following: the right to hunt, fish, trap and harvest without interference; the right to compensation for forest and mineral resources taken by non-Indians; the right to be exempt from all forms of taxation because they are seeking—"

[Failure of sound system]

Mr Davis: "—according to their own forms of self-governance; the right to receive sufficient resources to develop economically and socially according to the wishes of each band; the right to establish and control their own

schools and educational programs; the right to design and administer their own health and social service programs; the right to establish their own rules respecting membership in their bands and respecting order on their reserves and to police themselves through band constables; the right to safeguard all Indian sacred places and to practise their own religions, cultures and languages; the right to be fully involved in the process of revising the Canadian Constitution; the right to be fully consulted and involved in any changes in provincial or federal legislation, regulations and programs which affect Indian peoples.

"Be it further resolved that in order to redress the injustices of the past and to demonstrate respect for these aboriginal rights, the Canadian government should negotiate settlements for any outstanding Indian claims for land, hunting and fishing rights—"

The Chair: Mr Davis, sorry to interrupt you. We may be having trouble with the sound.

Interjection: Just if you press that button, it will—there you go.

Mr Davis: Sorry. I regret that.

The Chair: Go ahead, sir.

Mr Davis:—"provide sufficient resources to enable the Indian peoples to administer their own educational, health, social services and police programs and recognize the right of the Indian peoples to exclusively harvest wild rice.

"Therefore, be it resolved that this commission"—this is a commission, is it not?—"this commission support the principle of self-government and autonomy for Canadian native communities and support policies that will give native communities the economic tools that will allow them to attain self-government and autonomy."

We think the federal government should adopt this resolution in the main. It points, though, to a divided Canada as being necessary. The reason is the sovereignty-seeking natives do not wish to be included. There are elements that do wish, but there are larger elements that do not wish to be included. Therefore, it points towards a system of federated states which would be the form of the future for Canadians—for Canada. Quebec could be one of these federated states. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. Are there questions of Mr Davis? Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: I would just like to ask you, Mr Davis, your sense then of the native population as a separate nation. How do you see that functioning then, that there would be a series of nations within the country or there would be one native independent state?

Mr Davis: I cannot answer that question. I would say that it should be referred to the Indian bands themselves. If they are properly consulted they will work out a form of the Constitution which will suit them, but the important thing is that they should be consulted.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Davis, for your point of view.

Mr Davis: Thank you.

NORTH BAY INDIAN FRIENDSHIP CENTRE

The Chair: Could I call next Bill Butler from the North Bay Indian Friendship Centre. He is not here? No, he is coming.

Mr Bisson: Mr Chair, did the previous gentleman have a brief that he could have left with the committee?

The Chair: Mr Davis, members of the committee are wondering whether you have a written brief that you could leave with us.

Mr Davis: Yes, I do.

The Chair: We would appreciate that, if you would. Thank you.

Mr Butler, go ahead.

Mr Butler: Good afternoon. Greetings from the North Bay Indian Friendship Centre, Mr Chairman, as well as members of the select committee. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today to voice the concerns of the North Bay Indian Friendship Centre.

I would like to begin first by giving a definition of what a friendship centre is, for those who may not be aware of what a centre is. A friendship centre is defined as a non-political, non-sectarian, autonomous, community-based organization existing to administer and implement programs to meet the needs of urban native people. The concept of friendship centres originated in the mid-1950s. Its conception was sparked by the increased migration and urbanization of native people in Canada, not only throughout the 1950s but the 1960s as well as the 1970s. This resulted in an urban native community with very distinct characteristics and needs. This transition from rural to urban areas created the need for those support services and programs.

Historically, the reasons for this migration to the urban centres have been primarily for the purpose of accessing better educational and employment opportunities, as well as accessing a better standard of living. There were other reasons as well, some of those being access to specialized medical services, access to other social services, treatment for drug and alcohol problems, adequate housing, escape from sexual and physical abuse. More often than not, the end result was not much better than what they had chosen to leave when they had arrived in the urban areas. The pain and hardships endured by many of our aboriginal brothers and sisters are clearly documented in police files, social service files, children's aid society files and so on and so forth in other files.

1600

One of the existing problems or existing needs that we see in the urban area for native people is native day care. I would like to read a bit from a report that was submitted to our centre just recently from the Native Council of Canada and I will just give the executive summary on it.

"The paternalistic practices of the child welfare system in Canada have seriously damaged native families and communities. In light of this, native communities are beginning to address their needs for native child care programs with hopes for a better future. Native child care programs, they believe, will reduce the number of children coming into contact with the child welfare system and also

provide a means whereby native identities will be strengthened and their culture preserved."

Child care in Canada is neither universal nor affordable. If the Canadian day care community is widely perceived to be in a state of crisis, then the situation is several times greater for native families struggling to either educate themselves or support their families by working in the city. Most urban-rural native peoples are in a marginal economic position, face discrimination and come in contact with institutions insensitive to their needs. Their population is young, transient, highly underemployed, impoverished, is largely made up of young families and single-parent families headed by women. Despite the energy and increasing effectiveness of native advocacy organizations, aboriginal people remain a virtually invisible population in terms of day care statistics or initiatives. Their basic starting position of frequently enormous disadvantage is only partially acknowledged and their strengths as a people very rarely respected.

Traditional native child care emphasizes the central position of the child in the family and the community. Indeed, the child is a child of the community. People with whom the child comes into regular contact often become members of the extended family and as such assume responsibility for the care of the child. Native family systems, unlike the non-native nuclear family, incorporate extended family members from the clan, tribe, as well as members from the larger group. The child within native society is raised on values which emphasize autonomy, belonging, mastery and generosity. According to recent literature, the wisdom of native approaches to child care is now being recognized as a valuable contribution to the field of youth and child care.

Native people want the right to choose, define and run culturally appropriate services in programs which best meet their needs. Such programs and services would incorporate culture in both structure and program content, employ native staff, involve elders, grandparents and extended family members in transmitting cultural values and traditions. However, such development faces obstacles and barriers. Current government legislation and funding procedures define, regulate and control the establishment and operation of child care programs. The development of flexible models of child care, although increasingly supported by provincial governments, have not received the enhanced funding and resources required to succeed.

Native peoples are struggling to regain the right to self-determination and self-government. The development of new child care systems must be viewed within this context because I think it is a part of the struggle. The hopes and aspirations of native people in North Bay, in Ontario, as well as Canada, are not much unlike other Canadian citizens. We appreciate the recognition of the term "aboriginal" in the Constitution of Canada, but we need more than words on parchment. We need better housing. We need better housing standards in cities for all people, not just native people, and it has been clearly identified, when native people have not been able to access native housing or subsidized housing, they run into a myriad of barriers. When searching for housing, one of the problems they

encounter is stereotyping. I think stereotyping is probably one of the greatest problems that they encounter. It is followed by discrimination, prejudice, exorbitant rents and, I think, landlords who forgot that they were once children who had parents who had to find them accommodation. I think it is a basic, fundamental right of all people on mother earth to have access to housing, to shelter.

I think many Canadians never really fully understand what it means to live in a democracy, especially a multicultural democracy. There are those who have problems with the fact that there are employment equity programs and other such programs for natives and minorities, francophones, employment disadvantaged, disabled and women. In a sense it does hurt me as an aboriginal person to have people who think such thoughts as these, because there is a genuine need for these things. It is not as if they were invented by some policy analyst in Queen's Park or at the Parliament buildings in Ottawa. There is a real need for this and there is a history to justify the need for these and there are circumstances that led up to the development and implementation of these programs. I feel that this is a problem with many of the citizens of Canada, that they really do not have an understanding of why these programs are in existence.

One recommendation that I would give to this committee, as well as maybe a recommendation that will be passed on to your federal counterparts, is that there needs to be more education when developing and implementing and promoting a program. There needs to be more community promotion. The past history with the friendship centre, I have had on various occasions to touch base with employers, but also to touch base with other citizens in the community, and sometimes they are mad as heck because the native person is coming in and trying to access an employment need program. They feel threatened.

And I see the anglophones of Ontario feel threatened by the francophones, and the francophones may be afraid of what may be happening if native people come in and take their jobs, especially if the person is a native woman and is able to speak French. As the legislation exists, she would probably get the job, unless there was a disabled native woman who could speak French, who would probably beat her out.

I see a lot of fear and misunderstanding in the system. In terms of employment, natives are still under-represented in all areas of employment. It is a sad fact. I think the employment equity programs are good. The concept is good and I think they are helping to alleviate the problem somewhat, but I think a little that something else has to be done to ensure that it is not just all smoke that rises up from Queen's Park or Ottawa, and when the wind catches it, it all blows away.

I think the time probably is right to have, I do not like to say an enforcement agency, but someone to enforce the legislation, and I stand corrected if there is an agency or a ministry that does enforce or does go out into the community to see if the private sector and the ministries are hiring aboriginal people, women, disabled, everyone who comes under the target group.

1610

I think one of the things that needs to be done in terms of hiring, of employment practices, is that we need to look at the system that has been in place for many years, and that is the old boys who hire the new boys who become the old boys who hire the new boys. It is really a vicious cycle. I remember hearing someone speak not too long ago who said the reason why there are a number of francophone workers in the federal civil service is because a number of the old boys are now francophones and they will hire the young francophones who will in turn become the older francophones who will hire. One of the recommendations from this gentleman with regard to natives was that you need to get some of the old boys in there who are native who will hire some young native boys who will become the old native boys, and I think that applies not only to francophones and natives, but to women, disabled and minorities as well.

I have been hearing a lot of talk about feelings and I sense that the thrust of the feelings, or at least my thoughts about their feelings or what I am sensing from their feelings, appears to be that it is based on fear. I know when I was a young boy, if my father struck fear into me if I did not do something, I really did not perform very well. Even in my process of everyday working and family, if I feel as if I am forced into a corner, I usually come out the best way I know how, and sometimes that may not be the best way.

I am of Algonquin descent, mixed; my father is Irish and my mother was Algonquin Ojibway. The Ojibway nation and a lot of other nations have seven traditional values that, to me, are very important, and they are things that I wish would have been instructed and given to me as a young person. These values are things that need to be incorporated into native day care, because I see that for native people the reason for native people encountering numerous problems in mainstream society is that they are native people trying to be non-native people.

Not that there is anything wrong with being non-native. If you are white you cannot be black, and if you are native you cannot be non-native; you are native. Unfortunately being a native person for many of us who are native people is that we have lost our identity, have lost our cultural values and teachings that made us very civilized nations for tens of thousands of years before Europeans touched the shores of Canada, and we had a way to live and we had a way to exist.

The seven values that I am talking about are caring, sharing, kindness, wisdom, harmony, respect and balance. As I said earlier, many of the aboriginal people in this country have never heard of these values, or have heard of some or do not live a traditional lifestyle or do not have the values that were passed down from generation to generation.

It is quite evident that native people have not been successful in mainstream society. In the friendship centre we try to develop programs that will promote cultural enrichment, cultural awareness, not just for the sake of getting together and beating on a drum or socializing—yes, we do those things for these reasons—but it is also to

become familiar with who we are. As I look around the table I see many faces, but I do not know what your nationality is unless I look at your name. Even by your name I cannot tell because you come from two parents. You could be Italian and Jewish. You could be French and German. You could be Scotch—I will not say Irish, but British and something else. It is important that we as Canadians, and that we as Ontarians respect one another.

One of the most important traditional values of native people is respect. Unfortunately a lot of native people also have lost these values. We still have lots to learn. We have lots to regain. We cannot go back and change the past, but we can take a look back at the past. As well, this committee can look back at the past of how you came up through the ranks and how you all were in your constituencies, what made you the politicians that you are today.

These are specifically native viewpoints. I have a couple of other viewpoints on Canada and these are specifically my own. The gist of this was specifically my own because I really did not have much time to prepare for this.

Quebec: I love Quebec. Quebec is part of Canada. It hurts me to hear people talk about Quebec as a foreign country. They are not a foreign country. They are part of the fabric of Canada. Quebec was Quebec before French people were there, or it was part of the nation that the aboriginal people of Canada lived in.

I think most native people love Quebec as much as I do because we have a closeness to the land. We do not own the land. We just use the land and live upon it. It would be really unfortunate to have Quebec leave the country of Canada, as it would be unfortunate for Ontario or British Columbia or any other province to leave. I think that is something that, as a country, the country has to stand up and say, "No, Quebec, you cannot leave," and, "No, Ontario, you cannot leave," and British Columbia and any other province, "because you are a country."

Because we are a multicultural society we need to do some things and some of those things are that we must respect our brothers and sisters of all races. We must accept and understand the diversity of our different cultures, and we must understand our own culture and not be afraid to accept or understand other cultures, because it is only through the understanding that we will let go of the fear.

I thank you for having the opportunity to speak today. Meegwetich.

1620

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Butler. We do have time for one, possibly two questions.

Mr Winninger: Your remarks certainly carry a lot of weight, because historically it seems that however much hardship there was on reserves, off reserves the situation for natives has been bleaker still when they lose those constitutional protections they have enjoyed and the fiduciary responsibility the federal government has exercised over status natives on reserves.

It seems that one way in which you can fulfil that need is to establish more friendship centres. I know we have one in London that is very active and has a Sweetgrass day care centre which can inculcate those kinds of values you

are advocating. I guess it is premised on your knowledge of on-reserve facilities for families and day care, how you might see a self-governing arrangement evolving for family services and day care facilities. This links in with some earlier comments that were made today. Can you comment on that, how native people might—

Mr Butler: On reserve or off reserve?

Mr Winninger: Are you able to comment on reserve, first of all?

Mr Butler: No, I am not. I decline to comment on reserve.

Mr Winninger: What about off reserve then?

Mr Butler: I think that a policy with regard to native day care should be looked at at quite in depth when the province of Ontario would be looking at meeting with aboriginal people on reserve, off reserve, to develop a policy on native day care because it is a very worthwhile issue. As I said earlier, and the report stated, the day care situation in Ontario and Canada is in crisis, that native people who are always at the bottom of the ladder will suffer seven times greater or several times greater. Yes, and I think that it would be first and foremost.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you so much, Bill, for bringing very full answers on our first question on values and our second question on relationships with the native peoples. I hope you have been watching, as much as you could, what we have been doing in the last six or seven days. Many natives have presented to us and I think you would have been very interested to have been with us in Sault Ste Marie one day last week when we had four native women present to us. One of them had said the same as you, that for some time she had lost her culture and now had come back to spread it, and how endearing that was.

In this time and age when family life is under such stress and strain, you again this afternoon, as we heard many times last week, talked about family values, the necessity for having some roots in our lives and for building those on the values that you mention: honour, honesty, respect, wisdom and harmony. At a time when we are trying to work something out, I think we have to call upon those values. Some people call them virtues; you call them values.

I want to just thank you from the bottom of my heart for sharing with us so personally and with such clarity and the way you brought it with true respect this afternoon. Those you represent can be truly proud of you.

Mr Butler: Meegwetich.

The Chair: Meegwetich.

DAWSON PRATT

The Chair: Could I call then next Dawson Pratt.

Mr Pratt: First of all, I would like to let you know that I am presenting on behalf of the Nipissing NDP riding association and the North Bay and District Labour Council and advocacy groups in the community for the disabled.

First of all, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to discuss a new Canada. I commend this process, albeit a short-notice process. That is by way of an apology

for the rambling presentation that I will present to you, but hopefully there will be a thread to it.

I guess I will start off by saying that we need a Canada where all its citizens are participants and have access to essential services. We need to redistribute the abundant wealth of our country. We can do this through a serious tax reform. It should be a simple process based on net wealth. I am not suggesting that we impose unrealistic standards. However, there is no doubt that the vast accumulation of wealth has hurt our society.

Every citizen is entitled to and must have a minimum standard of living. That includes decent housing, proper nutrition, medical care and an opportunity to be trained and educated. Moreover, all Canadians expect and deserve access to a decent paying job.

The present minimum wage standards are a disgrace both at the federal and provincial levels. As Premier Rae has indicated, the best anti-poverty program is a decent paying job. All working people need to know that health and safety come first, not profits. If by any strange fate someone becomes injured then they should be assured and certain that all medical needs and rehabilitation needs will be honoured, and that they and their families will not suffer economic hardship.

Presently the Workers' Compensation Board process and bureaucracy have failed the working people of Ontario. We need to promote access to all avenues of life for disabled persons. It should come as no surprise that in Ontario and in Canada if you are disabled you statistically will be poor, undereducated and subject to systemic discrimination. This must not continue in a new Canada. We must institute across-the-board mandatory employment equity programs.

Governments and educational and training facilities must not only ensure access to admission, but access to success. Presently Ontario has a pitiful record in this field, particularly at the post-secondary level.

Workers must not be made the first victims of environmental legislative changes. The environment and alternative sources of energy and less dependency on fossil fuels must be pursued vigorously.

Canadians must not continue to assist the military-industrial complex in the proliferation and production of arms and weapons of mass destruction. Canada must pursue its own foreign policy and play a vital peacekeeping role. Recently our record has been drastically tarnished and it will be difficult to recover from these actions. However, we must advocate world peace and the reduction of the world's arsenals.

We are in a crisis with regard to health care and the runaway costs. Those with a vested interest control our health care model. We must front-end load our system to focus on prevention. How can we justify, in Ontario, spending more than \$5 billion on 6,000 physicians, nearly a third of our health care costs? I find this immoral and offensive. If we provide adequate housing and sufficient incomes for all our citizens in a healthy environment, then health care costs would decrease dramatically.

But let us not forget that the present system is a series of competing empires. Duplication and competition are ex-

pensive. Health care professionals and administrators are not encouraged to be creative or efficient. We have arrived at this position because the decision-making process is not democratic nor does it encourage consensus or participatory measures.

Canadians have been shortchanged by previous governments and multinational corporations in the management of technology, training and education. The tradeoff for the Mulroney free trade deal was to be vastly improved training opportunities. This has never materialized. We need federal and provincial training and education commissions that are employee- and employer-driven with outside professional advisory support staff, and the employee-employer representatives will have parity.

Canadians need to be certain that a minimum 2% to 3% of profits be invested in research and development. A training tax must be instituted to encourage and revitalize the apprenticeship programs. There is presently no real incentive for employers to see an apprenticeship through to its conclusion. Long and protracted labour disputes are extremely damaging to regional and local economies and create unnecessary hardships. Binding arbitration should be heard after a three-month period, and there should be the institution of antiscabbing legislation. Adequate, mandatory, portable pension systems must be implemented.

1630

Canadians must seriously reflect on the merits of toleration and acceptance. By way of an analogy I offer: When children grow up, they ought to be encouraged to maximize their experiences and potential and they are always welcome home despite any differences. If the people of Quebec feel that their destiny lies in a different configuration, then it is presumptuous of Ontarians to think that they can prevent or obstruct Quebec's right to self-determination.

However, what Ontarians and Canadians can do is treat Quebec as a brother or a sister and remain extremely close, appreciating the significant differences. Like brothers and sisters, we need each other. Co-operation should be the order of the day. In fact, this may expand and nurture all kinds of exchanges, for example, social and economic, and encourage east and west trade. We should never burn any bridges. Time and distance are great healers.

Canada should entrench in any constitutional amendments the rights of the disabled, aboriginal peoples, minorities, children and women. In reference to Ottawa and the federal government, the feds are only the sum of their parts and must play a key facilitative role. All partners in Confederation have an obligation to work in harmony. The present competitive atmosphere is the product of unbribed, free-market ideology and rugged individualistic attitudes. I ask you, do you want a Canada that allows one region or a province or a vested interest to profit at the expense of the common good?

We should stop emphasizing what divides us and refocus on what we have in common. International economy and globalization should not be synonymous with exploitation, lack of environmental regulations, health and safety regulations, low wages, no benefits, etc. Full employment must be our goal. It is tragic that 26,000 individuals have lost their jobs in Ontario this last month. There are 1.3

million Canadians unemployed and probably 200,000 or 300,000 Canadians that have simply given up.

We should emphasize economic diversification and local decision-making, and this is especially important in northern Ontario. Aboriginal peoples must receive justice and all land claims must be completed and self-government instituted. They must be given access to all government records surrounding their land claim disputes. The Indian affairs ministry must be dismantled and integrated into existing portfolios.

Those in western and eastern Canada who feel that central Canada dominates the political structure are correct. However, if we espouse democratic principles and believe in the notion of representation by population, the majority rules albeit not at the tyranny of the minority, then what mechanisms could we conceivably utilize to counter such lofty principles? I say none. To some extent we are at the mercy of our geography. We certainly do not support an elected Senate and only see an elected Senate as a further Americanization of our political structure.

We must encourage sensible distribution of immigrants coming to Canada, and Ontario in particular. We must make all efforts to encourage settlement in areas outside of the metropolitan areas. We must not encourage migration from northern Ontario. Governments should be made less bureaucratic and more responsive in a meaningful and timely fashion. Citizens are feeling alienated from the very processes and structures that were designed to make their life in Canada more meaningful and worthy.

We must encourage Ontarians and Canadians to reflect inwardly and ask themselves what can they do to make our communities, our province, our country and our world more caring and a decent place to live. By doing so, we are encouraging empowerment and collective self-determination.

Once again, I thank you for this opportunity and I apologize for the rambling nature of the presentation.

The Chair: No need to apologize, Mr Pratt. Thanks for your presentation. There are a couple of questions. Mrs O'Neill first.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Pratt, there were a couple of things you mentioned that I would like you to say a little bit more about. You talked about access to success, and I have a little bit of difficulty with that concept. I would like you to say a little bit about that. You also said, in relation to that statement, that that was particularly at the post-secondary level, and I wonder if you could be explicit in the example you are offering.

Mr Pratt: I speak from experience in my capacity of employment. I am the co-ordinator of special-needs services at a community college, Canadore College in this community, and have networked with all of the people who do likewise in the rest of the province. The province of Ontario undertook a task force report in 1985 that suggested that 1% of the budget be spent on special-needs services. At the present rate, 0.25% is spent, and that is based on 1985-86 dollars, ie, it means \$4 million has been allocated in the previous fiscal year and the real figure should be \$16 million based on 1985-86 figures.

I say that because the colleges have done a fairly good job of making the admission criteria more liberal. However, that is only one small component in the puzzle. Why I say "access to success" is that, what do we do and what services do we put in place to ensure that they will be successful? Getting in the door is only a very small part of the puzzle of getting through the system with the supports, which they will be able to get through, and being successful and being rewarded in an occupation rather than being on a pension or being on social assistance. This will also be helped through mandatory employment equity programs, but we have to have trained people to fulfil those equity employment positions.

Disabled persons are not looking for a free ride. What they are looking for is opportunity, and it can be opportunity to be successful or not successful, but given every opportunity.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I understand that. I did not realize you were the same Mr Pratt whose letter I had answered because you did not identify yourself in the capacity you just mentioned. I did not realize—

The Chair: Very briefly, Mrs O'Neill, as we are going to carry on with another questioner.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay. I did not think you were placing that just to the disabled. I thought you were talking about the post-secondary system in Ontario, which I think has had an outstanding success rate as far as employment is concerned.

My final question is: You talked about a training tax. Could you say a little bit about that?

Mr Pratt: I think that we should look at the models that have operated in Europe, and I know a number of people who have gone to Germany and looked at the apprenticeship programs there. I think if employers all have to pay or businesses have to pay a training tax, then they will be encouraged to utilize the services of apprentices. If they have no financial vested interest in the training programs of Ontario, then they ought not to use them.

The other thing is that in small communities, employers who do hire apprentices lose apprentices when they are taken by big corporations that do not spend the time in the apprenticeship program.

Ms Churley: You mentioned that workers should not have to pay the price for environmental cleanup, and I agree with that. I think we all would. Of course you said also that the environment should be kept clean. We should clean up the mess and we need also to make sure that we do not continue to pollute.

As you know, the government is bringing forth a new environmental bill of rights in the spring session. In effect, a couple of things that it will do is, one, allow workers to shut a plant down if necessary or at least stop work and, two, allow citizens to take polluters to court. The implications of that, as you can imagine, are pretty wide, and those are being worked on right now.

In the meantime, we have a dilemma. We are in a dichotomy where a lot of the work that is provided still comes from polluting industries. It is very expensive to retrofit those some of the time. This is something that we

all have to cope with. It cannot be environment versus jobs, yet we know that we have to stop polluting the environment. I am just wondering what your ideas are on how we can deal with that, particularly in the smaller companies that are polluting that provide jobs to small communities.

Mr Pratt: Well, I think you are right. I do not think there is a quick fix, but I think if money had been invested in research and development, then we would not continue with quick, fast-buck technology as opposed to technology that is out in the world. The pulp and paper industry has not incorporated the technology that is available in other countries around the world and it also has not managed a manageable product in such a way that we will have sustained economy.

1640

I think the tradeoff is that the training dollars have to be available to workforces that will be displaced by the environment, but I certainly think you cannot put the cart before the horse. The training dollars have to be there, companies have to be encouraged to develop new technologies that are non-polluting, and if we can reduce our reliance on fossil fuels, which are one of the leading polluters in our society, then we will have taken a step in the right direction. I think we have to have the support systems in place before we make those changes.

The Chair: One last brief question. Mr Offer.

Mr Offer: Thank you for your presentation. You have covered many areas in a comprehensive fashion. During our hearings we have been hearing many presentations dealing with the whole question of protection of language and culture. We have heard about the necessity of Bill 8, and some have come and spoken to us about enhancing Bill 8. Others have spoken about official bilingualism, a whole raft of opinions.

I am wondering, Mr Pratt, as you have gone through so many different issues and concerns dealing with the rights of individuals, if you have any thoughts that you might wish to share with us on the issue of Bill 8, its enhancement, or the position of Ontario vis-à-vis official bilingualism.

Mr Pratt: That is of significant importance, obviously, in our community with a francophone population in the district of Nipissing of 30%. I am certainly on record as endorsing Bill 8 and endorsing official bilingualism in Ontario. I think what we have to do is put aside the myths with regard to language rights in Ontario and get on and move into the future.

There has been far too much politicking about language rights for Franco-Ontarians, that Franco-Ontarians represent 500,000 people in this province. It is high time that we moved on to other issues. People in our particular district certainly understand the effects of underservicing in the language of their choice, so I think it goes without saying that in northern Ontario, and hopefully all of Ontario, we could get that kind of support.

The Chair: Okay. Mr Pratt, thanks very much.

STANLEY CERISANO

The Chair: Our final speaker this afternoon is Stanley Cerisano.

Mr Cerisano: Thank you, Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Stanley Cerisano, and I just received the eight questions that I am supposed to reply to. I will capsule my responses to these eight questions, and then I will go on to some other comments. Although I do not espouse all the virtues of Mr Pratt's views, I have some pretty broad views of my own.

"1. What are the values we share as Canadians?"

I would say quickly a harmonious melting pot of cultures and languages.

"2. How can we secure a future in the international economy?"

Improved communication and goodwill with our trading partners and cultures.

"3. What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?"

I believe they should ensure a high level of communication between Canadians and encourage learning of new languages in our schools, if possible.

"4. How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?"

I think this is an important question and I would advocate that they be granted their own form of government, beginning with law enforcement and justice and of course within our own system.

"5. What are the roles of English and French languages in Canada?"

Basically to promote harmony and co-operation between founding cultures and other cultures.

"6. What is Quebec's future in Canada?"

To remain in Canada as a partner with other cultures and work towards making Canada stronger and more successful in an international economy.

"7. What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic regions?"

I believe they should work towards the same end.

"8. What does Ontario want?"

Ontario should act as a glue that binds Canada together.

Now what do I want? My prime 1991 wish for a better Canada is a badly needed election reform. I would like to see:

1. The senators each elected for a maximum five-year term with obligatory retirement at age 75. In order to create a desirable balance to Parliament, each senator should be non-partisan and independent so he or she could vote according to his or her conscience rather than in accordance with the wishes of the puppeteer who appoints him or her.

2. Reform the electoral system so that each leader of a party, Prime Minister and Premier, not be required to contest the seat or represent a specific riding. I would prefer to see the leader of each party chosen by his elected colleagues rather than by the present very expensive and inefficient system. He or she might be elected Prime Minister or Premier by the elected MPs or MPPs of the prevailing party following a general election. His or her term should

never extend beyond two consecutive terms, and he should also be subject to review by his colleagues every two years. Possible replacement similar to the recent British action or even impeachment similar to the American system should be a distinct possibility, for the benefit of the party and the country.

3. Democratic elections should be redesigned to give the voter the choice of an individual candidate as well as a preferred party and its policies. The popular vote should not be obscured as it is now but rather be used to reflect a direct influence on which party is granted power.

4. No MP or MPP should be allowed to contest more than two consecutive terms. This feature might also be considered desirable if applied to municipal politics as well.

5. A system must be developed to reduce the exorbitant costs of contesting an election, which presently preclude many qualified candidates from seeking office.

The foregoing suggestions are not merely fertile ideas for improvement, but current events dictate that their implementation is essential to our political and economical survival. Is our present electoral system really democratic? Could it not be improved upon to avoid future Meech Lake, GST, deficits, free trade, pork-barrelling and other shenanigans? Without the required control checks and balances the blatant abuse of power displayed over the last few years will continue to fester and destroy us. Canadians deserve better.

If I might go on to the language issue. The language issue, Meech Lake, Bill 8, Bill 178, bilingualism and biculturalism are commanding too much media attention. As Canadians we might do well to stand back and analyse the whole spectrum of this fiasco. This is not a case of English against French sentiment, as some scribes infer. It is a simple case of a government-sponsored destructive division of our population.

Before this movement surfaced, the English and French Canadians, with very few exceptions, got along very well as Canadians, Catholics, Protestants, Jews and other denominations and ethnic groups. Splits create friction. Friction creates heat. Emotional heat combined with inflammatory instigation from Quebec and abroad results in animosities, dissension and sometimes violence.

Whenever you divide a group into factions you risk all of this. For example, our elementary and high school systems may be getting too expensive for the already overburdened average taxpayer to bear. The ever increasing divisions and demands in this area tend to compound an already desperate situation. First we had public and separate schools, then English and French, then ordinary French and elite French, What next?

The bilingualism-biculturalism policy would have succeeded if only the federal government had not conveyed the impression that French was being rammed down Canadians' throats, or if the wasted B and B funds had been more effectively directed towards encouraging the teaching of conversational French at the kindergarten level where it can be more quickly and easily absorbed. At the same time this policy would have generated a harmonious relationship among fellow students of all linguistic origins.

Ten years of this B and B policy could have produced a far greater number of fluently bilingual Canadians for business and government jobs, thus reducing the objectionable need to discriminate against those who are not fluently French. The Scandinavian countries' educational system, for example, requires that all their students study English in addition to their native language, as well as their choice of either German or French. Canada, including Quebec, would do well to adopt a similar policy in order to better prepare our students for the highly competitive global enterprise of the future.

1650

Refusing to learn and speak English in Quebec, or refusing to learn French in the rest of Canada, is counterproductive. It does nothing to promote Canadian unity or a harmonious relationship throughout the country. It is like cutting your nose off to spite your face.

When Bourassa sent his language bill to the Supreme Court for adjudication and then smugly thumbed his nose at the judges who brought down a decision which he did not like, he created a backlash in the rest of Canada which destroyed all sympathy for his Meech Lake accord and distinct society. He also undermined the honest attempts of other provinces to accommodate their francophones. Are not English-speaking Canadians of all ethnic origins justified in being incensed? Perhaps their reaction may appear too drastic, but they may also feel that their actions now are necessary to thwart further incursions into their constitutional rights and tax dollars.

The predominating mood that needs correcting is not so much the anti-French sentiment as the anti-English one. This destructive element originates in Quebec and is carried into Ontario and the rest of Canada, sometimes with help from the québécois and France itself. Would it not be productive and beneficial for our religious leaders of all denominations to instil Christian principles and unity rather than French or English nationalism, animosity and disunity among their flocks? Why can we not all lock arms, French, English and other ethnic groups, march forward together as Canadians in a spirit of harmony, co-operation and respecting each others' rights and aspirations? There may still be time to begin now.

Mr Bisson: The more I listened to your presentation the more intrigued I became, because you are sort of arguing on both sides of the issue. I guess I missed something.

You alluded in your brief to a reformed election system. I think I have to agree with you to a point with regard to how politicians may be perceived, no matter what party we are with and what level of government we come from. I think there is a sentiment out there that may be justified to a certain extent. Maybe sometimes it is also a perception that politicians are bad people or do not do the right thing or do not invoke the will of the people.

In your presentation you touched on two things that I found kind of interesting, that I would like you to expand on. One of the things you said was that you wanted to see a system of election by which MPPs or MPs would be elected as individuals but then we would vote for the party.

I take it that you are trying to get rid of party politics, but I do not see how that would happen. That is really what I would like you to talk on, that point. In other words, you said we elect the member, then we elect the governing party. I fail to see how that would get rid of party politics.

The second thing you touched on, electing the Premier or Prime Minister through the elected bodies of the Legislature or the House of Commons—I always thought it was a fairly good idea we have within a democracy that we as people within the nation have a direct say in who is going to lead our country, and that every four years we have a right and an obligation to pass judgement through our vote on whether we agree or disagree with his or her policies of the government.

Again, on that second point, what would it accomplish for us, as members of a Legislature, to elect our Premier and elect our leaders? Can you explain that to me? I cannot see the usefulness of that process.

Mr Cerisano: You must not forget the fact that the MPPs are elected by the general voters, then they in turn can choose their leader. What is wrong with that premise?

Mr Bisson: So you are advocating that the voters themselves would not have the choice of who would be Premier and Prime Minister.

Mr Cerisano: They would be electing more members of one party or the other, in that sense. I would like to discuss that with you some time. I think we cannot do it now.

The Chair: We are going to break now, so you can do it if you wish. That concludes the afternoon session from North Bay, here at the Royal Canadian Legion. We will resume at 6 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 1657.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1817.

The Chair: On behalf of the committee, I want to welcome everyone who is here this evening. For those people who will be following our proceedings over the parliamentary network, we are of course resuming the hearings of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation from North Bay, in the Royal Canadian Legion. We have had a full afternoon and morning of speakers today and we have also a full evening of speakers to hear from.

I would like to ask all of the people who are on the list—for those of you who have a printed list, there are a number of additions to the list—because we have been trying to be flexible in allowing people to get added to the list upon arriving at any particular destination, we do ask for the understanding of those of you whose names appear on the printed list, and indeed the others, to try to be as short as you can in your presentation.

We would like to ask those people who were on the original list to try keep their comments to about 10 minutes if you are making a personal presentation and up to 20 minutes if you are presenting on behalf of an organization. That will allow us to try to get through. We may have to trim the time as we get towards the end of the evening, but we will do our best to try to accommodate as many speakers as we can.

RONALD BOWES

The Chair: With that, let me start by calling Ronald Bowes.

Mr Bowes: A few years ago, at the times where you would get up in the morning and you would have breakfast, I would sit and talk with my wife. We would talk about how our kids went to school and now they have grown up, and then we would talk about our days at the deaf school and about graduating and what that was like and how the people have left home. Since that time, what we notice in our community is that many parents here have to send their deaf kids away, and in my wife's time she was actually sent away to a mental institution.

We talk about this and we remember this and it brings back thoughts of things that make us sad, when we hear stories in the community of deaf people; for example, in Quebec, how the government ordered the closing of deaf schools. Then they will open other schools and they talk about opening up services in other parts of Canada, but it is not what we need. There are a lot of gaps in the kinds of services that we have. We have 10 provinces, but the point is that we are underserved as a community, and not all the schools should be closed. What we want to do is to keep all our provinces together, and even if Quebec were to separate, what that would mean for us in terms of economy and the services and how that would impact on us.

I want you to think about helping deaf people. When I look back at our time, when people were sent away to mental institutions, this is wrong. We need a better system and we need clubs for the deaf here in North Bay and in Timmins and in Sudbury. I think it would be better if we

had those kinds of services to improve our life here in the north of Ontario.

I ask for your support in that, so that deaf people can continue to stay in the north and live happy lives. There is a community in Barrie of about 60 deaf people and we have some other deaf people around—there are about 20 who come to the club. But here in North Bay we have a really tiny community and we would like to see that support come from the government. I want to thank you.

The Chair: Mr Bowes, if you—

Mr Malkowski: I have a brief question, Mr Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr Malkowski, go ahead.

Mr Malkowski: In Saskatchewan, the school for the deaf there, there is talk of that school being closed. We talked about Quebec, how it may be closing the school and said we need a federal standard so that schools will not be closed, something to be enshrined within the Charter of Rights and Freedoms so we will see a standard, so deaf people will not have to worry about the closing of our institutions. You talked a little bit about how deaf people had been mislabelled and sent away to mental institutions.

Mr Bowes: Yes. You have to understand that when deaf people go into the clubs and socialize, that is our home. That is where we feel comfortable and equal. That is our community, where we feel empowered. Here in northern Ontario we need to have those institutions supported. We cannot financially support them and we need the support from mainstream society to keep our institutions alive.

Mr Bisson: Can you convey to the committee, and I guess for people who are watching, the importance of deaf culture in the development of children from the time of entering the school system to the time that they actually end up into the workforce, the importance of being educated within your own culture?

Mr Bowes: It is interesting. When my wife and I are talking sometimes—well, a few years ago, actually, when we were sitting together talking—this was after breakfast and we were reminiscing and thinking about how my wife's school at that time, why it is closed and what is going on. The deaf people are just sent off here and there and hidden away. We said, "Well, we can't change things," but then the war came and hearing and deaf people seemed at that time a little more—they seemed to understand a little better. But I think we tend to be forgotten about. I guess that is all I need to say about that. I do not know what else to say. If you want to ask me more questions, or do I ask you questions? I do not know what we do here.

The Chair: We will deal with questions, if there are any, Mr Bowes. Ms Churley.

Ms Churley: Actually, I do not have a question. I just wanted to thank you very much for coming out to talk to us. I think for most of us politicians the deaf culture is new to us, as well, and having Gary as our colleague has made a big difference to all of us in the—

Ms Churley: Actually, I do not have a question. I just wanted to thank you very much for coming out to talk to us. I think for most of us politicians the deaf culture is new to us as well, and having Gary as a colleague has made a big difference to all of us in the Legislature.

Mr Bowes: Oh, yes. He is our first in the world. He is wonderful.

Ms Churley: And we agree with you.

Mr Bowes: We finally have someone on the inside to speak for us. We were really happy in the summer to hear that Gary had won and that he is now sitting in Queen's Park in Toronto. This certainly gives us cause to celebrate. Finally, our dreams do get realized. We are very happy to have him and we would like to wish him the best. Am I done now or is there more?

The Chair: Yes, I think so. Thank you very much.

NATIVE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE OF NORTH BAY

The Chair: Could I call Archie Cheechoo, the chairman of the Native Citizens' Committee of North Bay.

Mr Cheechoo: This looks a little bit intimidating. It seems to me that I am being surrounded now and I am in the wagon.

I wish to thank you for being here and for being allowed to come before this committee to share with you some of my thoughts. I will be speaking on a first person basis with respect to my presentation, but the recommendations in my report can be cited as the recommendations of the native citizens' committee.

I welcome this unique opportunity to speak before a provincial delegation on constitutional issues on matters affecting Canada and Ontario. In particular I wish to address this from my perspective as a traditional native person of this country.

First of all, I am thankful for those Canadians of all nationalities who have expressed support for justice to aboriginal Canadians. Without their support, the governments of this country might not have adopted those changes that have occurred to date. These changes have not come easy for my people. My leaders have fought hard to realize a small measure of justice. I am also thankful to those truly honourable politicians who have spoken out in support of our cause and the lawyers, legal counsel who have given so much of their time, all these groups being aware that they may be rejected and affected by their stance on Indian issues.

As I followed the news reports on constitutional issues and our aboriginal concerns, I was left with the impression that they were trying to scare the public to believe we would take everything if we had the chance. Time and again our people have pleaded: "Let us run our own lives. We did it before and we can do it again."

Unfortunately for our people the Canadian vision is clouded with so many myths, prejudices, stereotypes and inaccuracies about our people, their history and their jurisdictions. These kinds of misrepresentative values extend right into the souls of our being. If we are ever to find hope and peace among us, we must learn to be human beings again. It hurts me to see how the so-called respected lead-

ers of this country throw aside the values of respect, honesty, truth and justice.

1830

Somewhere within our democracy, within the institutions of this country and province, we are completely missing the point. If we are to coexist meaningfully in this country, we need a new order and we must reassess everything from our values, our teachings, our institutions, our governing structures if we are to have a positive impact on the way our society thinks and the way we relate to each other. Federal and provincial leaders must be prepared to make changes that have never been tried before.

For example, the educational system must be completely overhauled at the elementary and secondary levels. Curriculum that teaches respect, honesty, truth and justice must be the cornerstone of a new educational process. Curriculum must be developed with our traditional and historical accuracies included. Our people should be directly involved in the development of new approaches.

In those areas and regions of Canada where other cultures are a majority, such as German, Italian, Chinese and so on, they should be allowed the right to include curriculum geared to their cultures. In our Indian communities native curriculum and language should be mandatory and supported legislatively by the province of Ontario. Program contents should stress peace and unity and express the many cultures of Canadians and their contribution to the Canadian mosaic.

Assimilation into the larger Canadian context is no longer a workable solution. The desire of Quebec to have a distinct society is honourable. However, its policy is assimilationist for the aboriginal inhabitants of that province. Quebec desires recognition but fails on the other hand to suggest the same medicine for the aboriginal nations in Quebec. We must be careful as a nation to protect all interests and especially the aboriginal people. Without our full involvement Canada cannot claim to the world community to be a nation that strives for justice for all.

Our leaders try to raise issues of justice for our people but we are segregated by a legal system that is not open to matters of moral justice. In many instances, a legal right for you has meant a denied moral right for my people. The governments of this country must address our rights. The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights demands such a requirement.

The Nishnawbe-Aski Nation of northern Ontario in 1979 presented its case before the fourth Russell tribunal at Rotterdam, Holland. The case involved our questioning of the validity of the James Bay Treaty 9. The arguments to our case were accepted by the international jurists. Both Canada and Ontario were found to have contravened a number of articles under the declaration of human rights. Canada is a signatory to that UN convention.

Deal with us honestly and fairly. Settle our outstanding claims and issues. Let us feel a part of our own country. Let us into the federal and provincial confederation without legislative straitjackets.

I suggest the province consider seriously the following additional recommendations:

1. Support the aboriginal people to be full partners at all future constitutional conferences, whether they be between Canada and individual provinces and territories or between Canada and the provinces and territories.

2. Even though the territories have a majority native population, support their desire to become provinces.

3. We challenge the province to develop legislation and through an order in council recognize Indian self-government flowing from section 35 of the Canadian Constitution.

4. Within Ontario, we suggest the convening of provincial constitutional conferences between Ontario and the aboriginal Indian organizations and their member nations and/or people they represent to address these issues. Further, we suggest these conferences be fully televised.

5. We recommend that Canada and Ontario renegotiate the James Bay Treaty 9.

6. We recommend that Ontario negotiate with our people of Treaty 9 to settle outstanding compensation for the loss or displacement of our right to hunt, fish and trap which has been affected in some cases for ever. The loss of our economy has not been adequately dealt with through occupied crown lands.

7. Due to the displacement of our right and livelihood by resource development, we recommend that these companies compensate our people through a percentage share for the extraction of the natural resources from our displaced areas.

8. We recommend that Ontario and Canada protect our traditional religious ceremonies and our sacred and ceremonial sites through provincial legislation and constitutional enactments. The United States Constitution carries that protection for the aboriginal people in the US.

In conclusion, I feel the road ahead constitutionally is not clear at this time. My people have been let down so many times. It appears Quebec is hardening its position because of this. I wonder if again we as native people will become the expendable item on provincial and national agendas. While I try to be optimistic, the reality of Kahnawake and Oka are still a burning reminder of how quickly a government can be militant towards our issues and concerns.

I do believe, though, that many Canadians wish to see a just settlement of native concerns. It however seems their governments have not been as accommodating to date. I do believe our mutual desires to achieve a better world for our respective cultures in a collective Canada is an honourable and just goal, but do not forget us this time.

The Chair: Mr Cheechoo, I think I can say on behalf of the committee that as you have pointed out in your closing comments, many Canadians want to see a just settlement of the various outstanding native issues, and I think that has certainly been true in the kinds of presentations we have heard so far, a cross-section of people, both native and non-native people. I can assure you that there is that sense within this committee and obviously within the government. But having said that we realize, as I think I said a couple of nights ago, that words are not sufficient and that in the end it will be the deeds that will tell whether in fact any progress has been made. We are conscious of that.

Mr Bisson: I originally started off with one question and ended up with a list of about 20. There are many things you touched on that I would like to be able to really sit down and have a discussion about and it is something that I am carrying on in my own riding, obviously.

There are two things I would like to touch on. One comment that you made really, I right away marked out as being the number one thing that I had to ask you. You made the comment in your presentation that recognizing Quebec as a distinct society, although desirable, meant the assimilation of native people within Quebec. Can you explain that?

Mr Cheechoo: Okay. The aboriginal people in Quebec like us are seeking recognition, have been seeking recognition in the Canadian Constitution for their self-government and the issues and the concerns that we have with respect to our own jurisdictions within our provinces are being left behind because of it. Do you understand what I mean?

Mr Bisson: So what you are saying is you are afraid of being lost in the shuffle.

Mr Cheechoo: Okay, what I am saying is that Quebec is going for a distinct society. I say that is good. They want to go for a distinct society and they are looking for those additional powers, but at the same time they are not looking at us and recognizing the same thing within the native community.

1840

Mr Bisson: Okay. I have got you. But the second part of the question, and very quickly, is the new-found hope that you are feeling as a people with regard to the goodwill that is being expressed. I think we have been hearing fairly constantly through these hearings that people are genuinely saying: "We support self-government for aboriginal people. We think it is long overdue." You know there is a lot of good support there. First of all, how does that make you feel? Obviously, the question is self-answering, to a certain extent, but how deep do you think that goal is? How deep do you think the support is?

Mr Cheechoo: I think there is one way to explain that. A lot of the non-native people who have come and participated in our ceremonies, who have begun to know about us, who begin to know our culture have had a different opinion. They have changed in their thoughts and opinions about our people and I think that is a plus.

The other thing is that I was involved in the political arena for 17 years at the constitutional conferences, as well. I was working with a lot of lawyers and I worked with a lot of people who were genuinely interested and genuinely wanted to understand where we were coming from. As a result of beginning to understand that we were not wanting the whole thing, that there was a way we could find a compromise, I think then they began to give us that support. I think what has not happened is that what we have been talking about has not been clearly expressed in Canada before, and so that is what has made it difficult for a lot of people to be able to understand what we have been talking about in terms of sovereignty, in terms of self-government.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation as you have taken us so clearly through a series of recommendations. There are two questions I want to ask. The first is if you might share with the committee something about the Native Citizens' Committee of North Bay, something about its composition, when it was in existence. I think that that would be helpful for us, but before we get on to that there has been obviously a great deal of discussion and there shall of course be much more dealing with the whole question of Quebec's place in Canada and any new reconfiguration of Confederation or what have you. With that, of course, many people have come and spoken to us about the necessity of clearly recognizing first nations' self-government and a whole list of other matters.

My question is if you might share with us whether you as a representative of this particular committee are looking at the different scenarios that Quebec may undertake with a view to seeing how your negotiating position may be changing. For instance, Treaty 9, correct me, does that not traverse two borders, for instance, Ontario and Quebec?

Mr Cheechoo: No.

Mr Offer: No, it does not, but is there something you will be looking at in terms of what Quebec does and how it might impact on who and when and how you negotiate?

Mr Cheechoo: I think that is a question that could better be answered by the native politicians who are dealing with those kinds of issues. I am just a representative of a native citizens' committee, and the reason that that native citizens' committee came about was as a result of a provincial requirement on another matter that we are involved in, dealing with the anti-drug strategy in the province of Ontario. In order for us to be involved there we formed this native citizens' committee to deal with that. We heard about these hearings and decided just to flow right in and make a presentation to your committee. We are not involved in any areas politically. I am just voicing my own individual ideas and our committee is making these recommendations to you.

For the other issue, I think I would leave it rather to the native politicians to deal with that with the government.

Mr Offer: Thank you and thank you for your presentation as it goes again through some very specific recommendations.

RAYMOND DESROSIER

The Chair: Could I call next Raymond Desrosiers?

M. Desrosiers : Je me présente ce soir à titre personnel. Cher Président, chers membres de la commission, il me fait un grand plaisir d'être parmi vous ce soir. Il me paraît ainsi qu'il y a une lueur d'espoir pour la francophonie ontarienne. Malheureusement, le tout me peine aussi énormément que nous voilà encore obligés de justifier notre présence, notre existence, notre survie même.

Cette courte présentation est pour moi une chose assez difficile. J'ai été il y a environ 18 ans un produit d'assimilation. Je suis né à Iroquois Falls en Ontario, où la population est bilingue et puis c'est assez difficile de garder sa langue et sa culture lorsqu'on est quand même une minorité.

C'est par une crise d'identité et un effort continu que j'ai pu reconnaître la richesse des deux langues. Alors pour moi, un Ontario bilingue est une affaire de cœur.

Je suis le père de trois beaux enfants. Avec mon épouse nous tentons de renforcer chez eux une prise de conscience, de fierté, de tolérance et d'acceptation de toutes les races qui cohabitent ensemble. Ils sont à la fois francophones, Ontariens et Canadiens. Leur langue, leur culture et leur cœur sont francophones et nous voulons, comme de raison, qu'ils deviennent des adultes responsables et fiers. Mais nous ne voulons pas qu'ils soient obligés de se battre constamment pour leur langue et leur culture. Nous ne voulons pas qu'ils se fassent dire : «Speak white» ou de démenager au Québec s'ils veulent parler français. Nous voulons qu'ils respectent les autres et qu'ils soient respectés pour qui ils sont. Il est difficile de garder chez eux cet esprit innocent et tolérant lorsqu'ils nous demandent pourquoi ils se font appeler «stupid frogs» ou «dumb Frenchies» sur l'autobus par des enfants de six à treize ans. Je reconnais qu'il y aura toujours du monde naïf, ignorant et préjugé, mais comme peuple et comme province nous devons agir et non seulement réagir.

La situation de Sault-Sainte-Marie de janvier 1990 était déplorable et abominable. Ce qui était désastreux a été le manque de leadership qu'ont démontré les deux paliers gouvernementaux face à cette intolérance. Hier, c'étaient les francophones à Sault-Sainte-Marie, et depuis toujours on sait que ça a été contre les autochtones. C'est le temps d'agir. Ne permettons plus à une autre génération de subir ces injustices. Agissons aujourd'hui. Pour nos enfants c'est le cœur qui prime. Leur cœur fragile, leur innocence et leur foi sont entre vos mains. D'ici quelques années, ce ne sera plus seulement leur cœur qui va réagir, mais aussi leur tête. Alors c'est aussi une affaire de tête.

Cette nouvelle génération devra pouvoir se justifier auprès de ses pairs. Elle devra défendre son héritage, sa langue, sa culture et ceci à maintes reprises. Cette jeunesse croit encore que la justice domine et cette justice est créée par des gens dans les postes de pouvoir. Pour eux, le gouvernement est un organisme à défendre le bien contre le mal.

Nous développons chez eux une appartenance et nous leur disons que nos membres élus sauront faire ce qui est bien. Ces gens sauront t'aider à t'épanouir, à devenir un être total. Ils te permettront de t'éduquer en français de la maternelle jusqu'au stage collégial ou universitaire. Ils sont, eux, des gens tolérants, raisonnables et droits. Pour des jeunes de cinq à dix ans vous êtes leur protecteur. C'est logique, vous êtes les élus, les modèles de notre société. Vous pouvez, si vous le voulez, garantir des droits simplement parce que c'est bien. C'est bien de protéger les autres, c'est bien de prêcher et d'agir contre l'intolérance. Je n'ai pas dit que c'est facile, mais bien. Notre jeunesse a besoin de découvrir ce que leurs parents ont perdu. C'est important, même primordial qu'ils aient confiance aux gens élus pour les protéger. Pour eux c'est logique, c'est simple, c'est aussi une affaire d'esprit.

J'utilise ici le mot «esprit» dans le sens de courage. Le courage est une vertu enviable que nous souhaitons en toutes circonstances aux gens qui nous sont chers. Le courage, je crois, vient de nos convictions personnelles, de

notre héritage et de notre milieu social. Nous avons tous à prendre des décisions qui ne sont pas populaires mais qui sont pour le bien de tous, et même dans certains cas pour le bien d'un peu.

Comme père de famille, nous élevons nos enfants avec amour, justice et droiture. Nous devons, à quelques reprises, châtier même si cela nous crève le coeur, mais nous le faisons pour le bien de l'autre, à long terme. Souvent on voit le mépris dans les yeux de ceux qu'on aime, mais nous savons que le tout était juste. Ce serait si facile de dire : «Fais ce que tu veux et vis avec les conséquences». Cela est trop facile.

1850

Notre situation actuelle en Ontario ressemble invariablement à une situation de famille. Ce sont dans certains cas de petites chicanes de famille, mais si nous hésitons trop longtemps avant d'agir, le tout pourrait prendre un virage pour le pire. Nous sommes rendus trop loin pour abandonner la lutte. Il faut avoir le courage de nos convictions. N'est-ce pas pour cela que nous sommes ici ce soir ? Ainsi, un Ontario courageux qui fonce devant est aussi une affaire d'esprit.

En conclusion, comme vous l'avez sans doute remarqué, je n'ai pas parlé des minorités, d'argent ni de méthodes administratives. J'aimerais, du plus profond de mon coeur, de ma tête et de mon esprit oublier les concepts de minorités. Les anglophones, les francophones, les autochtones, les Italiens etc sont tous des gens qui ont des besoins, des aspirations et qui demandent au gouvernement de reconnaître leurs droits et leur survie.

Malheureusement, je suis ici surtout comme père de famille et je n'avais que quelques précieuses minutes pour partager avec vous mes sentiments les plus sincères. La question d'argent et d'administration est mieux laissée aux experts.

Tout ceci est probablement du déjà-vu pour vous ou même du déjà-entendu. Je crois sincèrement que l'Ontario doit accepter un rôle de leadership dans ce pays. Avant de prêcher aux Québécois comment répondre aux besoins de la population anglophone, l'Ontario doit faire un geste concret : reconnaître sa propre population.

L'Ontario doit résoudre les disputes avec les Amérindiens et pour toujours trancher la question du bilinguisme. Pour moi c'est simple. C'est plus qu'une affaire de coeur, de tête ou d'esprit, c'est la survie. Pas de solutionspansements, s'il vous plaît. Un Ontario bilingue serait non seulement un geste symbolique, mais aussi une affirmation que nous n'accepterons plus d'intolérance. Je compte sur vous, mes enfants comptent sur vous.

J'aurais quelques recommandations précises : que l'Ontario démontre un rôle de leadership en se déclarant officiellement bilingue ; que l'Ontario établisse un réseau d'institutions postsecondaires en français, tant au niveau collégial qu'au niveau universitaire ; que l'Ontario abandonne sa philosophie de groupe minoritaire et qu'il traite sa population également ; que l'Ontario exprime franchement et clairement par des actions concrètes qu'il ne tolère pas cette vague d'intolérance qui existe présentement. Merci.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Desrosiers. Est-ce qu'il y a des questions ?

M. Beer : Je pense que ça peut être utile. Surtout à la fin vous avez parlé d'une période d'intolérance qui existe actuellement, si je comprends bien. Je me demande si selon vous, depuis deux, trois, quatre ans vous avez remarqué des changements. Vous avez dit qu'il y a intolérance maintenant, mais n'y a-t-il pas quand même des changements positifs dans la vie des francophones dans la province au point de vue de la mise en vigueur de la Loi 8, des changements dans le domaine de l'éducation ou est-ce que là vous parlez plutôt des réactions de certains groupes d'anglophones aux francophones ?

M. Desrosiers : Je parle un peu des deux. Je crois que, dernièrement, surtout depuis l'échec du Lac Meech, les francophones ont assez d'efforts à faire beaucoup plus. Si je parle de la Loi 8, par exemple, qu'est-ce qui était un peu injuste de la Loi 8 ? On s'est fait dire à maintes reprises : «Use it or lose it».

Ça, ce n'est pas une garantie de nos droits. Je crois qu'il est injuste de la part du gouvernement de nous dire : «Utilise-le ou tu vas le perdre». Ce n'est pas une garantie.

M. Beer : Qui a dit cela ?

M. Desrosiers : Ça a été dit à plusieurs reprises, je crois, dans les conférences de presse ; je ne peux pas citer exactement.

M. Beer : Vous voulez dire les gouvernements ?

M. Desrosiers : Je ne sais pas si c'est officiel du gouvernement mais je crois que oui.

M. Beer : Ça me surprend.

The Chair : Okay. Other questions? Mr Malkowski?

Mr Malkowski : I am wondering if you think it is vital for Ontario to take a first step in officially recognizing bilingualism, and if that will have more of a positive impact in the Franco-Ontario community.

M. Desrosiers : Je crois que oui. Je crois que l'Ontario doit se montrer le leader dans le pays maintenant. Nous devons, par nos gestes et pas seulement par nos paroles, agir et démontrer à la population de tout le pays que nous croyons au bilinguisme, que nous croyons que les francophones, les anglophones, les autochtones, tout le monde a des droits. On parle de deux langues officielles, mais je crois que c'est important de s'affirmer et de lâcher d'en parler, de trancher la question pour une fois et toutes. Une fois que c'est officielle, une fois que les droits sont reconnus, je crois qu'on peut commencer à réparer les dommages.

Mr Malkowski : As a supplementary, did you mention not only bilingual but more of a multicultural aspect such as inclusion of native, francophone and anglophone being recognized as official languages? Did I hear you right?

M. Desrosiers : Non, j'ai dit les deux langues officielles, bilinguisme, mais je crois que nous devons reconnaître quand même le droit de toute la population et arrêter de parler des minorités, parce que lorsqu'on parle de minorités on parle un peu de ségrégation si on le veut.

DAVID BELL

Mr Bell: Prior to my briefing, I would like to thank the committee for coming to North Bay to hear its citizens comment on Ontario in Confederation. The committee is making every effort to hear as many Ontarians as possible in a restricted time period, not limiting itself to mayors and group representatives, but also hearing ordinary voting citizens of the province, high school students like myself included. I respect this committee's mandate, appreciate the efforts of its members and thank them for the opportunity to speak today.

It appeared nothing less than a miracle: 11 first ministers in agreement on a solution to the constitutional impasse. Our leaders exited a closed meeting in 1987 and dictated to us the future of Canada in the Meech Lake accord. Canadians had had no opportunity to share their insights on constitutional reform and no chance to voice any of their concerns. Eleven first ministers avoiding media attention and public scrutiny was hardly a way of keeping a nation together. Democracy did not even present itself in the negotiations at Meech Lake, let alone flourish. The Ontario government must learn from past errors at the bargaining table to ensure that any future constitutional reforms are properly debated and properly understood before they are implemented.

The "distinct society" clause of Meech Lake should not be considered in any further constitutional negotiations because of its costs. By identifying Quebec as a distinct society and specifying that the role of the Quebec National Assembly is to "preserve and promote" the province's distinctiveness, the Supreme Court would be interpreting two Canadas, one for Quebec, another for the rest of Canada. This would be nothing less than two solitudes and two Canadas. As I see it, distinctiveness implies superiority and conflicts with the principle that everyone is equal. The message in the Constitution would be a contradiction. It already acknowledges that everyone is equal. By adding an interpretative "distinct society" clause, it would extend the definition to, "Everyone is equal, but some people are more equal than others," and this is unacceptable.

Ontario's leaders must not surrender to ultimatums which allow no compromise, nor should they sacrifice everything to keep the country as it is today. In this context, I am again referring to the province of Quebec. Ontario can only do so much praising to make Quebecers feel wanted. If Quebec leaves, a member of the Canadian family is lost. Notwithstanding all the turmoil and social costs such an action would bring, Canada, if it continues to maintain a federal system of government, will survive and progress. The provincial government must understand that better ways exist to preserve a country and amend the Constitution. Giving in to blackmail must never be one of them.

1900

A serious problem already exists in Canada's Constitution: section 33, known as the "notwithstanding" clause. It stands to reduce everyone's rights; the federal and provincial governments can limit some of the most fundamental liberties that are guaranteed under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The "notwithstanding" clause makes our Constitution worthless. The provincial and fed-

eral governments almost arbitrarily can stomp on the rights of Canadians. The Ontario government should rally to remove this threatening clause in any further constitutional negotiations and show its commitment by banning its use in the Ontario Legislature.

One man who spoke to this committee in Sault Ste Marie feared that a race in Canada may face treatment similar to the Jews of Europe during the Second World War. In reality, a holocaust of sorts has already occurred in Canada. Our ancestors directly and indirectly supported the brutal treatment of Canada's natives. Throughout Canada, Europeans disregarded native rights to the land, forced them on to reserves, attempted to assimilate them—the list goes on.

Canadian governments can and should do something. As far as financial compensation is concerned, there is no pricetag; it is immeasurable. Compensation can originate from another outlet, the recognition of the native peoples in the Constitution. The underlying theme of the current Constitution is that two nations founded Canada, England and France. In layman's terms, this statement is a lie. Canada's Constitution is incomplete until it recognizes the three founding nations of Canada. The governments of Canada must reaffirm their commitment to native self-government and act on their promises. Native self-government is not a privilege but a fundamental right. Whether it currently recognizes this in the Constitution is secondary—it should.

Due to time, I will quickly move into my discussion on official unilingualism, an all-too-common municipal declaration for 1990. The actions of countless Ontario municipal councils are unjustified, unnecessary and deeply regrettable. The declarations are in response to Ontario's Bill 8. Bill 8 has no bearing on municipal services in the least. Official unilingualism declarations only make francophones and minority groups in Ontario feel alienated and send a message to Quebec that Ontarians are racist. Extremists in Ontario, no doubt a small minority, are hiding the truth in a bed of lies and are receiving much attention in the process.

Not all Ontarians are racist. Only a tiny minority, verbally or literally, find amusement in stepping on the fleur-de-lis. One speaker who appeared before this committee in Sault Ste Marie outlined the principle that you come to Canada to become Canadian. Unfortunately for her, we are not a melting pot. We never have been. She and the Sault's mayor Fratresi know where they can go to find the melting pot, the inordinant worshipping of the flag and the Superbowl game, which leaves the rest of us. The concept of multiculturalism in Canada is older than Confederation. The vision in this woman's head conflicts with hundreds of years of Canadian history.

Rejecting our multicultural heritage would be ignoring the vital contributions of the broad spectrum of cultural groups to the development of this country and their important role in establishing our national identity. This country requires tolerance and unity in order to survive. Ontario and Canada need strong leaders, leaders who listen to the people and leaders who act on what they say. The principle of one Canada must be maintained and never sacrificed at

the bargaining table. Before entering into further constitutional negotiations, the Ontario government must reject the idea of a Canadian confederacy and reaffirm its commitment to one Canada.

I would like to conclude with a proposed preamble to the Constitution Act, suggested by Pierre Trudeau and vetoed by the provinces. In my opinion, it is nothing short of poetry, and actually inspired me to speak before this committee. It states:

"We, the people of Canada, proudly proclaim that we are and shall always be, with the help of God, a free and self-governing people.

"Born of a meeting of the English and French presence on North American soil which had long been the home of our native peoples, and enriched by the contribution of millions of people from the four corners of the earth, we have chosen to create a life together which transcends the differences of blood relationships, language and religion, and willingly accept the experience of sharing our wealth and cultures, while respecting our diversity."

This is my vision of Canada. Word for word, it is the kind of "Canada" clause I want written in the Constitution. "There is so much good in Canada," says Sinclair Ross, "and you always throw it away." Let us not throw away what could be our last chance for one Canada.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I think there are a couple of questions, but let me, on behalf of the committee, express to you again, as we have done a number of times when young people have spoken to us, appreciation for the clarity with which you have expressed yourself. I think it bodes well for all of us.

Mr Bisson: I appreciate your presentation. One of the things you said, and I have to agree, is that not very many of us believe this country is—the term being used is "racist," that people out there, on one side or other of the issue, are of that persuasion. I think that is a very small minority; I agree with you.

But one of the difficulties we have, quite frankly, is that there is a lot of rhetoric in this debate. When we talk about the distinct society or bilingualism there is a lot of rhetoric. It seems to me, as an observer at this point, that we need to somehow remove that rhetoric so we can finally sit down as a people, we as Canadians, and try to come to some sort of understanding, trying to meet some of Quebec's aspirations, if that is what we decide to do at the end, or go whatever.

I am wondering what you have to suggest with regard to being able to do that, as a younger person in our society. What needs to be done to finally get people in this country, once and for all, to sit down and speak about this issue in a very rational manner, taking away the façade of all the very strong comments that are made on both side so the issue?

Mr Bell: It is a passionate issue, but I think it is very difficult for anyone, especially my age, to have an opinion because of all the rhetoric: "notwithstanding" clauses, "Canada" clauses. They are all terms I have difficulty understanding, and it took me quite some time to understand. I think we should go away from examining the Constitu-

tion and examine what is important to us as Canadians and then write it down, not writing it down in glamorous legal terms so that no one can understand it. I think it is important that a Constitution, which is so important to a country, should be understood by the electorate, not just by an élite group.

Mr Bisson: But specifically what I am getting at is the rhetoric around the issue, because there are people who feel certain things on both sides of the issue and they are quite valid in their perspective, from where they are standing. When I talk about rhetoric, I mean the rhetoric utilized by some of us sometimes, not on the technical end of wording in the Constitution but how we label each other. Somehow we have to remove those labels to be able to get to the issue, and that is where I was trying to—

Mr Bell: Name calling, things like that?

Mr Bisson: Yes, because there was some of it used in here, and that is what I was alluding to. Is there a way we can get rid of that?

Mr Bell: What examples of rhetoric in my—

Mr Bisson: Some of the labels we utilize sometimes is that Quebec is a cry-baby, or anglophones are being racist if we say we have problems with bilingualism. How do we get rid of some of that rhetoric to get to the issue?

Mr Bell: More committees like these, that are advertised, so we can get people from both sides of the issue instead of name-calling; to not yell at each other but listen to each other's arguments and perhaps make a compromise. Compromises are so important. Ultimatums are dangerous, and I have stated that the Ontario government should refuse ultimatums.

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are going to have to move on to other speakers.

1910

JOHN LUTES

The Chair: Could I call John Lutes?

Mr Lutes: I would like to begin by congratulating Gary Malkowski on his election. I think it is tremendous that there is now a deaf MPP, someone in the Ontario Legislative Assembly who represents the interests of not only the deaf but also the hard-of-hearing. My presentation tonight is about the hard-of-hearing, and I am speaking as an individual consumer.

You may be aware that about 10% of the population in Canada has a hearing loss. Of that population approximately 90% are hard-of-hearing, and this proportion is going to increase rapidly. I say that because, as we all know, there is a rapid increase in the proportion of the aging population of senior citizens. Fifty per cent of senior citizens 60 and over have a significant hearing loss. In addition, there is another cause for the rapid increase in the number of people who are hard-of-hearing, that is, the noise level in the environment, both industrial and recreational.

Let me give you a little background about the hard-of-hearing. The hard-of-hearing are a marginal group in society. They are neither deaf nor have normal hearing. We do not sign and we are not part of the deaf culture. Even

though we function in the hearing world, we are on the fringe because we cannot hear normally. It is really well known that the hard-of-hearing tend to be isolated from the mainstream of society. Thus, we are caught in the middle, between these two worlds, between the deaf world and the normal hearing world.

Hearing impairment is an invisible disability, and hard-of-hearing people do not generally reveal themselves. Being hard-of-hearing somehow seems less dramatic and hardly disabling, certainly more hidden than being deaf. Normal-hearing people seem to believe that someone with any degree of hearing loss is deaf or that they simply cannot hear, and they lump everyone with a hearing loss into the same boat. To illustrate, the hard-of-hearing are often referred to as deaf, deafened, oral deaf, partly deaf, going deaf, stone deaf or even hearing-impaired. They are rarely referred to with the term or label we prefer: "hard-of-hearing." Our choice of the term "hard-of-hearing" is illustrated in the name of our national consumer organization, namely, the Canadian Hard of Hearing Association.

It is really frustrating to be hard-of-hearing. You constantly wonder if you heard or understood what was said. It is lonely a lot of the time, and to feel isolated from other people is really not a very good feeling. To be hard-of-hearing is to have a disability of communication, and the very nature of hearing loss is that it affects human contact and participation with others. Hearing is that vital sense which enables people to comprehend the thoughts, ideas and feelings conveyed through speech. But when an individual suffers a hearing loss, the ability to understand accurately what others say is adversely affected. Thus, conversation, that all-important link between people in the hearing world, is often misunderstood, distorted and even lost.

We listen in context and frequently misunderstand what is said, and it is really no wonder that hard-of-hearing people are sometimes left out and on the fringe or on the outside looking in. I would like now to give you a personal example to illustrate this sense of being on the fringe. On 1 July 1990 I attended, for the first time, Canada Day celebrations in Ottawa, mainly because they were finally accessible. They were accessible to deaf people through American sign language and *langue des signes québécoise*, plus oral interpreters in English and French in an FM system. I was able to use the FM system and hear.

Since I was a young child I have been attending public ceremonies like Remembrance Day, cub and scout parades, political rallies, concerts and other similar functions. However, I could never fully understand what was said because of my congenital hearing loss. But that was not the case on Parliament Hill on 1 July. For the first time in my life I could hear every speaker, every word that was said. In fact, the FM signal was so clear that I could even distinguish the instruments of the RCMP band. Never in my wildest dreams did I ever think this would be possible.

I was so moved by this experience that when the proceedings began, tears began to run down my cheeks and I could not stop them. They just kept going. Of course, being a male and being in public with thousands of people around, I was embarrassed and I kept wiping the tears

away, but they kept coming. I really did not understand what was happening to me. It was only later that I realized that I was crying because of the sorrow from all the years of attending countless numbers of activities in large groups and not being able to hear and feeling left out. And I cried in joy because, for the first time, I felt part of a public ceremony simply because I could hear. In order to feel fully Canadian in that one instance—I felt that because I could hear.

When we think of the impact of hearing loss, it is usually about the impact on people with a severe or a profound loss. However—I really want to stress this—people with even a mild loss, let alone a moderate one, like myself, we are affected too. It does have an impact on us; at least in my experience, it does. So after 51 years, I finally felt a complete part of a Canada Day celebration, and therefore my sense of identity as a Canadian was fulfilled. To me, that is what access is all about. Without access, hard-of-hearing people are denied the right to participation and therefore we are really denied the right to full citizenship.

How can we overcome the barriers that exist between us and the normal hearing world? Here are a few things that I think ought to be done before hard-of-hearing people will be on an equal footing with everyone else.

First, that we ensure that every hard-of-hearing person who needs a hearing aid or hearing aids or assistive listening devices receives them. In the province of Ontario, we have what is called ADP, the assistive devices program, but that is not a universal program. It is kind of a patchwork program. For example, it pays only 75% of the cost of the minimum model of hearing aid, first. Second, it only pays that portion of one hearing aid, so if you need two, it is rather like needing a pair of glasses, one lens for each eye, and being told that it is recognized that one lens will do. There is that aspect of it, so I am recommending that a universal program be set in place.

Second, that a licensing board replace the current monitoring board in the province of Ontario to regulate and oversee professional practice and hearing aid vendors, thus ensuring a high quality and uniform standards.

Third, that we ensure that the environment is adapted so that it is not partially accessible but fully accessible. This means that only public facilities but places of employment as well. All places that are part of daily living ought to be accessible to us. Ontario can demonstrate some leadership here and ensure that all services delivered by the government of Ontario are accessible, not just the buildings but that the people providing the service are aware of hearing impairment and know how to relate, not only to hard-of-hearing people but to deaf people as well.

This evening, these presentations are not accessible to deaf and severely hard-of-hearing people who are watching this on television. We have sign language interpretation for Gary, but that is not distinguishable on television, nor is there an instantaneous captioning so that people can read the proceedings as they are happening. So this is an illustration. In addition to that, there is an infrared system here, and that system is available for French and English translation. I could have used the system, except that the adaptive

device was not available so I had difficulty hearing some of the comments that were made. So I think we need to be thinking in terms of full accessibility and not partial accessibility.

Fourth, that the education system make the necessary adjustments—and note I am saying the education system make the necessary adjustments, not the hard-of-hearing students—so that achievement by hard-of-hearing students will be similar to that of normal hearing students. That is far from the case now. I refer you to the very recent report of the educational review for deaf and hard-of-hearing students in Ontario, and I would also like to make the point that as an employee of Canadore College and a student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, I recognize that there certainly is a significant level of underfunding for special needs in the colleges and universities in Ontario and I would like to recommend that this be reviewed and adjusted.

1920

Fifth, in the whole area of employment, in my experience, large numbers of hard-of-hearing people are underemployed, and I am encouraged by the comments regarding employment equity.

Sixth, that oral interpretation be officially recognized and that programs be established to train oral interpreters in Ontario. Just as there is a desperate need for sign language interpreters for the deaf, there is also a similar kind of need for oral interpreters for those who have a profound hearing loss and rely on lip-reading or speech-reading as their means to understand.

Seventh, that a disability training unit be established within the civil service with a mandate to orient provincial government employees about disabilities, and to train them how to relate to disabled persons, including the deaf and the hard-of-hearing.

The last recommendation I want to make to you is about noise. Noise is a major cause of hearing loss and it is permanent and irreversible both in industries and in recreational use. If any of you spend a lot of time with a chainsaw or sitting on a skidoo, then you are in for a noise-induced hearing loss.

I think there are three things that the province can do. One is to amend the Ontario Occupational Health and Safety Act so that the maximum allowable noise level in the workplace is 85 decibels and not 90, as is currently the case. The international accepted standard is 85 decibels. Another is to establish suitable regulations governing the noise level of manufactured products sold in Ontario, whether they are for industrial, recreational or home use. Third is to embark on a major, province-wide educational program about the risk of noise. I do not think people realize the impact and the extent to which noise exists in the society and the impact that it has on hearing loss.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lutes. I will allow one question, Mr Malkowski, if we are brief, and with the answer as well, because we are beyond the time already.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you, John, for that excellent and very inclusive presentation you made about the hard-of-hear-

ing situation. If you would not mind just briefly commenting about the rights of hard-of-hearing children as they relate to, let's say, cochlear implants, and as well, if you could also talk a little about the educational system and the isolation that a hard-of-hearing individual might feel in that system and how one might get to the parents in terms of resources. Could you talk a little bit about that, please?

Mr Lutes: Would you repeat the second part of the question, please?

Mr Malkowski: You want the last part?

Mr Lutes: Yes, about education.

Mr Malkowski: I was just wondering what kind of help parents might have if they have a hard-of-hearing child in the system. How we could get information and resources to the parents? They often are missing that kind of information to make appropriate educational decisions for their children. If you could talk a little bit about that.

Mr Lutes: Right. I am not the best one to speak about that, because my experience is as a hard-of-hearing individual and I have not been the parent of a hard-of-hearing child. But it is something that I have thought about once in a while.

One of the issues, of course, is the whole issue of choice, whether the child with a severe or profound hearing loss ought to adopt the signing route and become part of the deaf culture or whether the child ought to opt for—whether the parents of the child ought to opt for the oral route; that is, speaking only. It has been an issue of grave concern for a very long time.

I have thought about it a great deal and it just seems to me to make sense that a child who has a profound hearing loss ought to be able to learn sign language as a first language first, following which learn how to speak as best as possible. I have been exposed to quite a number of young people whose parents have decided they should go the oral route. Some of them have done remarkably well and are able to articulate and speak well without difficulty. However, there are quite a number of others who do not learn to speak such that they can be understood well by others. When that is the case, of course, it affects their level of education and it affects their ability to have employment.

I think then it is important that parents who are in a situation of having to make that choice, ought to have all the information of both sides of the argument and present it in an objective way. I do not know how that is done, Gary, but that is my feeling about it.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lutes.

WOMEN'S ACTION COMMITTEE OF NIPISSING

The Chair: Could I call next Pam Alcorn and Marie Marchand from the Women's Action Committee of Nipissing.

Ms Alcorn: Good evening. I am Pam Alcorn and I am speaking as a member of the Women's Action Committee of Nipissing. The Women's Action Committee of Nipissing was founded in July 1989. Women's groups and individual women continued networking following a meeting with the Ontario women's directorate. In December 1990 we adopted the following mission statement:

"To promote the empowerment and status of women in Nipissing district through the elimination of barriers to the full participation of women in all spheres—economic, social and political."

I would like to begin by acknowledging that my own experience working with groups in a democratic process causes me to realize how difficult it is to share a vision of the way things can be. I have been involved with women's issues and women's organizations since 1984. I have become increasingly involved in women's groups on a local and provincial level, mostly addressing the issue of male violence against women. I am here trying to share my vision of our future with my fellow and sister Ontarians and Canadians.

I first learned of this meeting last week as a result of a phone call from this committee's consultant on women's issues. The next day, I arranged to have a copy of the discussion paper *Changing for the Better: An Invitation to Talk about a New Canada* forwarded to me. I was told, however, it would take seven to 10 days to get here. That would have brought me past this point. Luckily, a copy arrived at my place of employment on Friday. As a result, I am not able or prepared to give any great depth to this discussion. I will, however, refer specifically to a couple of statements contained in the public discussion paper as I make my points.

To begin with, page 23 states: "Your reflections as a citizen of Canada and a resident of Ontario are vital. Your voice needs to be heard."

Ms Marchand: My name is Marie Marchand. I am the secretary of the Women's Action Committee of Nipissing, and I am also the project co-ordinator for the two-year women's demonstration project entitled *Women's Access to Apprenticeship Training*, funded by the Ministry of Skills Development and the Ontario women's directorate.

I would like to add my welcome to the members of the committee to our community. I am pleased to see that you had the good fortune of choosing northern Ontario as the first stop for these hearings, allowing us to set the tone.

Pour ceux qui d'entre vous qui sont d'expression française, je vous souhaite la bienvenue. Je vous dis bienvenue, surtout que cette semaine est notre Carnaval et semaine française, et je suppose que malheureusement vous n'avez pas l'occasion ni le temps de fêter avec nous.

Mr Malkowski I am particularly pleased to see. I wish I had known you were going to be here so that I would have had an opportunity to at least learn a few symbols to tell you that I am indeed very pleased to have you here in our community.

Perhaps it is also auspicious that we are making our voices heard as women on the day before Equality Eve: 14 February is the 10th anniversary recognizing the fact that more than 1,000 women went to Ottawa to pressure the government to ensure that equal rights were firmly entrenched in the Canadian Constitution. We hasten to add, however, that we also have other anniversaries. As women, we also remember 6 December 1989.

You are thinking about keeping the country together; we think about walking the streets in safety. You want to

celebrate our differences; we would like to celebrate the end of sexism and violence against women and children.

1930

We received the invitation to take an active part in these meetings late. The letter from the Minister without Portfolio responsible for women's issues urging us to take the necessary step to bring "our own perspective" to these public debates was dated 31 January, for meetings which began in the north on 4 February. I saw the public discussion paper for the first time yesterday. While we appreciate the invitation to join with you in discussing a new Canada, please bear in mind that we have not had the luxury of sitting down quietly to gather our thoughts on these vital issues. Yet, we cannot remain silent. We realize all too well that silence is our nemesis.

As women, we definitely want a just and honourable peace in the Gulf. We want to be tolerant and caring. We want to compete in the global economy. We want the federal and provincial governments to play fair and be true partners. We want quality of life, justice and self-government for our first nations. We want our second and third nations to speak with one voice in their respective languages. We want our sisters and brothers in Quebec to stay with us as part of one family. We want the west, the north, the Atlantic region to feel they share the same opportunities that we do here in Ontario, and we also believe this is what many others in Ontario want.

Certainly to achieve any one of the above requires substantial change, so while we realize that the original plan is basically to drain the swamp, we are so busy fighting alligators that we may lose sight of the cosmic picture.

Ms Alcorn: We agree that our voices must be heard, but we are sceptical and we are cynical. Perhaps a brief history of the issues facing the women of this community at a federal, provincial and local level will help explain why we are unable to speak in this forum in a formal manner and why we are unable to address specific constitutional issues as women of Canada.

Meech Lake: Women who opposed this as a constitutional option were often accused of being anti-French. In fact, many women shared concerns raised by native groups that our rights would not be enshrined in this formula.

March 1990, the federal budget cuts to women's and native programs: Women's groups are underfunded. Page 7 of the discussion paper reads: "In response to the growing appreciation of the demands of justice and equality between men and women, the Charter also prohibits discrimination on the basis of gender and asserts that charter rights are guaranteed equally to people of both sexes."

While the legal barriers to women's active participation as Canadians are being removed, other more insidious barriers are popping up. Funding cuts to already underfunded women's programs and women's services make it almost impossible for women to adequately and effectively address these obstacles. Our guaranteed equality thus far is on paper only.

As citizens of Ontario, we are witnessing changes—more women in government, more women on judicial benches, more women on provincial committees. This

trend must continue until the power is balanced. This trend must extend beyond party lines and beyond provincial lines. We are still at risk, however. The Askov decision and the actions of some courts to stay the prosecution of sexual assault cases is an example. This is unacceptable. This goes against a long, difficult struggle which many women have faced to finally have the criminal justice system treat sexual assault as the serious crime we know it to be. Survivors of sexual assault usually fear that their complaint will not be taken seriously. Throwing out these cases only reinforces these fears. Women, again, are compromised.

At a local level, women have been reacting to many issues and in general our experiences have been unsuccessful at best and life threatening at worst. Example: the live pornography industry. When women have tried to address this industry as one many of us know to be harmful either directly or indirectly to women, we were publicly ridiculed by local journalists and, during a civic meeting, by politicians and the general public as well. What happens to our freedom of expression, our freedom to safety of person, our rights to equality?

Another example: North Bay has recently experienced the convictions of sexual assault of one long-time high school teacher and one influential paediatrician. While the teacher is serving a jail term, the paediatrician continues to practise in both hospitals awaiting an appeal of the conviction. Despite many concerns raised by various members of our community, the message to victims of sexual assault of this type is clear by the lack of response from our medical community. The safety of female children is expendable.

Example: North Bay has yet to receive funding to adequately address the lack of services for sexual assault survivors. Even though a community proposal has been submitted to the Ministry of Health, the funding available is not adequate. \$65,000 a year does not adequately address the growing needs of the increasing number of women who tell us they have been sexually assaulted.

At a time when the federal government is dismantling our national railway and slashing the budget of the CBC, the national public broadcasting system, which can only result in isolating Canadians farther from one another, we, the citizens of Ontario, must join hands. We must come together in a way that includes every citizen of our province to achieve a true consultative process in realizing our future.

I applaud our new government's initial efforts to begin the exchange of ideas, but we must recognize that this is only the beginning. True communication and consultation will require many more meetings. We will be interested in expanding on these ideas and issues so that we can do more than merely scratch the surface. We will remind the government as often as necessary that the consultative process is one that is animate, not stagnant; it needs feeding in order to grow.

Ms Marchand: Confederation is the state of being together. You have just heard some of the issues that Pam and I feel we face as women. We recognize also, however, that we are before you as white, middle-class individuals. We do not pretend to speak for all women, but we feel safe in telling you that all women, and hopefully everyone,

want to be equal socially and economically, not almost equal. This cannot be achieved through the intolerance that we, as women, see directed towards us and also the intolerance directed at so many others as well.

As a society, we seem to have lost the will to care for each other and also to take care of each other. The elements required for a true partnership are missing: the shared goals and objectives, the interests of all being fairly represented, the sharing of knowledge between and among family members, the need for clearly specified roles and responsibilities.

We can tell you that as women we are always watching our backs. We keep chipping away at society's attitudes to cries of: "Oh yeah? Well prove it to me," and then when we do, "Sorry, I just do not believe you." We may win an argument here and there, but the real victories are few and far between and these so-called victories are constantly being challenged even after they have been achieved at such a high price. We keep finding ourselves back to square one.

Our vision: Do we have the right to be safe in our home, at work, in the street? Yes, we do. Do we have the right to speak out and not be silenced by people whose list of intimidation tactics is endless? Yes, we do. Do we have the right to sit at the decision table, any decision table? Yes, we do.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for coming out tonight to speak to us, especially considering after the short notice. That was the difficulty we had. We chose to go to the north first, but of course you are the most disadvantaged in that you do not get the booklet and the time to prepare, but we have discovered that people have given, in many ways, more presentations from the heart, which means that we have received a lot of discussion around our value system.

You mentioned that tomorrow night is—you explained it and I know I do not have time to go into it—equality eve, and that women are getting together all over Canada for dinner tomorrow, and of course I will be missing mine in Toronto.

I know that I have been talking to some women in Toronto who were involved 10 years ago and who tried to get involved in Meech and were shut out, as you mentioned. The fears now are around that even if a new constitution includes equality for women, there could be problems with social cutbacks on equal social benefits. etc., which of course really affect women and children. I am just wondering if you have had a chance to think about that and talk to other women about that yet. My sense is, and I know that I as a woman, beyond this committee have not really figured out yet my role and our role in this process as women and how we can make sure that we are involved at the table this time, beyond these discussions at committees.

1940

Ms Alcorn: I think one of the things we have to make sure of is that we are part of the consultation and women's groups—I think we have to be listened to. We have to have a voice.

As important and as crucial as the timing is for this kind of a meeting, I do not think we can hurry the process up. If we try to hurry it up, we are not going to be heard, we are not going to be able to talk. We need the time and I know from the consultation and conversations I have had with other women that there is deep concern about what will happen to women's programs. Women's programs have historically tended to be expendable, as the recent funding cuts federally indicate or prove, underfunded at best and always at risk.

Ms Marchand: I would add to that that there is some concern we are going to go into a Meech 2 and that the gains we made 10 years ago, we may have to fight for again.

Ms Churley: So it is a step backwards.

Ms Marchand: Before we leave Ms Churley, may I simply mention that you are one of our heroes. When you were on Metro Toronto council and the stand you took against beauty pageants, some of us wrote you a letter and of course if you do not remember, we are going to be terribly disappointed. I would like to congratulate you on that stand that you took and also on getting elected.

Ms Churley: Thank you. I have to say I got a lot of letters of congratulations, but I got some real ugly hate mail as well. So I was very happy to get the many letters of congratulations and thank you for that. Of course, I remember.

One of the questions ever since we got the charter in 1982, or at least one that as we move farther along—now we are we almost nine years—has been in part—I do not think there is a right or wrong answer to this question, but I would be interested in your reflections on it. Through the charter, we seemed to put so much into constitutionally trying to protect a whole series of rights, whether it was women's, aboriginal or linguistic, and I guess one of the things we have learned is that you can put a lot into the Constitution, but that does not by itself bring nirvana. We have just been mentioning the problem of when there are cutbacks in programs and that kind of thing.

I remember being struck one time in listening to Pauline Jewett a couple of years ago, who noted that on section 28, the gender equality clause, that actually there were more court cases working their way through the courts around men than there were around women. Clearly that was not the reason intended when that went in. I assume that here in North Bay and Nipissing when you were trying to work against pornography and the different things you ran into—so we are also struggling again with attitudes.

We go forward and we look at a lot of the things that are going on and you really wonder, do we keep moving backwards despite all of these changes? How do you see that balance between what we need to try to ensure is in the Constitution and I suppose really the kind of political action that is required to change the way we do things? You just mentioned to Marilyn the issue of the beauty pageant. How do you see that? Are there specific things that here in your own community you are trying to do around attitudes? Here we are. We are legislators and we

can pass all kinds of bills and what not, and I suspect the longer that one is a legislator and the more bills you pass, the less you wonder whether that always achieves the ends that supposedly you are after, because we keep coming back to this question of attitudes.

Ms Marchand: I think that was a long question, but if I—

Mr Beer: It was sort of a reflection I have been wanting to get off my chest for a while.

Ms Marchand: If I can synthesize, I hope what you are asking, how do we strike a balance between enshrining our rights in the Constitution and making sure that attitudes in society change? Fair enough?

Mr Beer: Yes.

Ms Marchand: First of all, I think they have to be enshrined in the Constitution, because if they are not stated there in black and white then it just reinforces those attitudes which already exist. My difficulty is that even though we were declared persons some years ago and we now have the right to vote and we can now get elected to Parliament or to the provincial Legislature or to the Senate, those were all steps that we had to make very slowly, but if they were not enshrined in some kind of legalese, we would not even be able to attempt to make those steps.

Second, we recognize that yes, there is a difficulty about attitudes, and that unless the political leaders who are enshrining rights in the Constitution are prepared to back it up through their own example and through their own use of the legislative process, it is useless in a situation like that. Women like us in our individual communities are trying to seek Band-Aid solutions, sort of one drop at a time, when we are not tackling the real issue at all. We are perhaps tackling a local situation in hopes of making it better, but we are not at all tackling the real problem.

As our recent difficulties here with the live pornography issue show, it took 11 months of fighting at a municipal level with no sort of—although we made overtures to the provincial and the federal levels by writing letters to the ministers responsible for whatever, we would get these lovely letters back saying, "This is what we are doing and this is what we have done and thank you very much for your letter." Not very helpful.

Unless the legislation is backed by political leadership willing to put teeth into it, it is very ineffective because you have individuals like us in our individual communities battling sort of one battle at a time and never ever winning the war.

The Chair: I will allow one more quick question, Mr Harnick.

Mr Harnick: A very quick question: You have alluded to almost a breakdown of the deterrent effect of the criminal law generally, and I suppose more specifically as it relates to this community. You have mentioned the Askov case. We from Toronto know that we can pick up our newspapers and read the crime reports as if they are baseball scores, how many murders there were that week and how many sexual assaults. We do not expect that is happening in communities far from Metropolitan Toronto. Evidently it is. Has there been a breakdown in so far as

you are concerned of the deterrent effect of the criminal law?

Ms Alcorn: I think what I was trying to refer to is that progress is beginning to be made with the criminal justice system, but it is still very much set up for the accused. So the rights of the victim are rarely considered. We can point to financial costs. That is definitely the main argument we seem to hear.

But the criminal justice system, the judicial system is not set up—it is not a comfortable place for women at the best of times, adversarial, and so women's groups have been fighting very hard. Each government I think is trying provincially to address it, but it is not enough.

Then when we think we might be making some progress, and some communities have victim-witness programs and some courts receive training on issues of male violence against women, we fear that these cases will start to be thrown out. The message is definitely backwards. It is definitely taking steps backwards to women. It is a clear message that, what was this, was this just momentary? Can we count on it? That is one of the biggest problems, what can we count on?

Ms Marchand: If I may just briefly add to that, one of the difficulties we have with the number of cases that are being thrown out of court is that it seems to us that there is a disproportionate number of drunk driving cases and sexual assault cases being thrown out. I do not have access to the statistics, but it just seems by looking at the media that this is what is happening.

We have a difficulty with that in the sense that it is a system that is geared to the accused. You have a defence attorney for the accused appearing before a judge who probably used to be a defence attorney as well, saying, "The rights of the accused, my client, have been violated." The judge agrees and throws it out of court. The victims are once again victims.

1950

In a local situation here with the paediatrician, we have a real live conviction and the victims are still on the losing end, because he continues to be allowed to practise, continues to have hospital privileges while he awaits his appeal, so we certainly feel that with the justice system, even though you are trying to make it better for everyone, the charter argument is being used against us.

Mr Harnick: Has North Bay been a jurisdiction where the Askov case has been a problem? Because I was not aware that North Bay had reached that level.

Ms Alcorn: No, I do not think that is what is occurring here. I think our courts are trying to speed things up. I think we need more judges appointed to deal with this, and crown attorneys definitely, to deal with this, but no, we are not in that regard. That is not one of the ones I am aware we are facing.

Ms Marchand: But there are two very recent cases in Sudbury, however, where one judge threw it out after a 17-month delay, and another judge on a sexual assault charge after a 23-month delay said, "Well, I am not going to throw it out," so there is no consistency.

Ms Alcorn: Meanwhile the women victims are wondering, "Did I go through this horrendous process this far," because most women do describe it as horrendous and I know that has been covered in the media, so there is the uncertainty and the insecurity.

Mr Harnick: I might tell you that the standing committee on administration of justice is going to be—I think not next week, the following week—reviewing the idea of a victims' bill of rights, which has been considered at the committee level before. Hopefully the government will now act on it once this report is prepared.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Let me just say that I think as a committee we are conscious, very much, of the concerns that you raised at the beginning of your presentation about time. We have heard that already from other groups and we take those concerns very seriously. We do not presume that in this first stage we are going to be able to touch all of the bases that we need to, but we will do our best, and we will structure in the second stage of our work after our interim report in March more concerted ways of allowing even more discussion involving the various constituencies, and obviously among those are the women of the province.

NORTH BAY PEACE ALLIANCE NORTHWATCH

The Chair: Could I call now Brennain Lloyd from the North Bay Peace Alliance and Northwatch?

Ms Lloyd: Good evening. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you. I am going to speak somewhat casually. I have not prepared a formal presentation. We will be submitting written comments in the near future, but with fairly short notice and with a great number of very pressing issues on the table with the organizations I work with, there was not time available to prepare a written submission for this evening.

The organizations I am speaking for this evening are two. The North Bay Peace Alliance is a local group addressing peace, disarmament and security issues at a local level, and they in turn are a member group of Northwatch, which is a coalition of environmental groups across north-eastern Ontario. My comments will largely follow from the concerns of that constituency.

When I read your discussion paper, the discussion paper circulated relevant to this committee's work, I found that there were questions I wanted to ask and wanted to answer in advance of even the ones that were being put forward to us in the discussion paper. The first question was put forward to us as, "What are the values we share as Canadians?"

I think before that we have to share some common sense of what is a Canadian, and perhaps to do that we have to have a shared idea of what is a country. That is the point I would like to start from, what is a country? I would suggest that a country is a community. It is a community of communities, but it is a community. If we look at community and the concept of communities, perhaps we should look at why we have communities.

Where does that need for community come from? Where does our interest in creating community and being part of community come from? My sense of it is that it comes from a need for security, that this is our most fundamental need; our most fundamental interest is in security.

When I look at your paper I see it addresses quite repeatedly, quite consistently, questions of economic security, but I do not accept that that is the most fundamental kind of security, that that is the kind of security we crave most or that we require first and foremost.

I think there are basically three kinds of security: There is international security, which is the kind of security we look for in our foreign policies and our relationships with other communities, with other nations, with other states; there is ecological security, the kind of security we look for in protecting our environment and in environmental safeguards, ecological systems being protected and preserved; and then there is economic security. And we cannot have economic security if we do not have ecological security and we do not have international security.

It is perhaps possible, although questionable, that we could have international security without economic security, because those are such interrelated questions, that we could have ecological stability, ecological security, even if we did not have economic security.

I think there is a hierarchy in those securities, and I would certainly say that economic security, while very important to us, is not at the top of that hierarchy. So I was somewhat disturbed at the emphasis I read in this paper, with economic security given such priority and those other securities so absent. It is those two other securities I would like to speak to this evening.

When we look at the first question of international security, our situation is obvious tonight. We are at war. And when we look at the state of that war, it is heart-breaking, heart-wrenching. If we listen to the 6 o'clock news this evening we hear there were 500 people killed last night in a bunker in Baghdad, and we are told by the allied forces, those military forces we have linked arms with as Canadians, that that was a military target. But there were 500 to 1,000 civilians killed. How do those two pieces of information fit together? I would say that they do not fit together.

I think we are in a time of perhaps unparalleled insecurity internationally. We have lived with 40 years, four decades, of the cold war and all of that insecurity, and now we have moved into a new kind of insecurity. We have perhaps lessened the cold warrior stances, but our international insecurity is at its peak. For the 500 people who are being dug out of the bunker in Baghdad today, it is beyond its peak: It is death.

When we look at our international security today, we have to look at Canada's role in that international insecurity and question it and reject it. This evening before I came here we were at a peace vigil. Every Wednesday evening in North Bay we mark the war, we gather together and remember that we are at war. We have one week of war, we have two weeks of war, we have three weeks of war. We do not know how many weeks of war we will have, but we have had too many. Every Wednesday evening we

gather for half an hour in the cold—tonight very cold—weather, and we gather because we think it is important that we mark another week of war, and that we remember what this war is about. The war is perhaps about territory, it is perhaps about oil, it is perhaps about economics, but more than anything it is about human suffering and it is about loss of life and it is about ecological disaster. That is what it is about. Every time we hear about collateral damage and every time we hear about operation this or operation that, we are forgetting what this war is about.

So when I think about what Canada is, right now I think Canada is a warrior. Canada is playing at war. It is a very dangerous game and it is an unacceptable game. So we are at war and that shadows everything. It shadows all of our self-perceptions. It has to shadow and colour all of our self-descriptions for us as Canadians, because we are at war. We are in a war we do not understand, did not choose to involve ourselves in. We were not asked as Canadians whether we wanted to be involved, and we are at war.

2000

We live in a community in North Bay where many of our friends and neighbours are in that war. Their lives are at risk, and for many people in this community it is a very difficult thing, because not for a second do we want to say we do not support our friends and neighbours and the people who are married to the people we work with and go to school with. It is a very close thing, as people from our community are there. Not for a second do we want to say we do not support them, because we do support them.

We support them in their right to life, we support them in their righteous quest, but we do not support our government in its decision to send them to a war. We do not believe that people in North Bay who are in that war joined the military because they wanted to go and kill people in Baghdad in a bunker sleeping at night. We do not believe that of our friends and neighbours. We think quite differently.

But we are in a very difficult situation. It is very difficult to talk about it, to express that support and caring and concern and still express that disagreement we have with our government. So when we talk about Canada and we talk about what our role is in Canada, we have so much discomfort with what Canada has become in these recent weeks. That shadows everything.

We look at our self-perception or our self-description and think: How does this fit? How does how we are behaving now fit with our self-perception and our self-description? Traditionally Canadians have seen themselves as peacemakers and as peacekeepers, as keepers of the peace. We have participated in the United Nations international peacekeeping forces: peacemaking forces, not war-making forces. How does this fit? I would say it does not fit. We have abandoned our international peacekeeping role and are part of a very terrible war, a war that is threatening to get worse and worse.

I would just like to read a quote from one of the people we are following in this war, one of those individuals who are giving us our lead and giving us our direction. Republican Dan Burton said two days ago: "If conventional bombing

does not get the job done, I think it is extremely important that we use everything possible to protect our troops before we send them into ground combat. If we use tactical nuclear weapons, I think it can be effective in getting this war over in a hurry."

Those are the people we are following in this war. We could have another Hiroshima, we could have another 100 Hiroshimas. One air-launched cruise missile has 15 times the power of Hiroshima. We must imagine that. Imagine Hiroshima and the death and destruction of a Hiroshima, and multiply it by 15 times for every air-launched cruise missile that could be used. That is what the United States has always reserved as its right; within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization policies we see the first-strike policy. What is a first-strike policy? It is their right to use nuclear weapons should conventional warfare escalate to a degree that it is no longer manageable or controllable in their determination.

That is where we are right now. For Canada as peacemakers that is where we are right now. We are following not cold warriors any more, but nuclear warriors. Where do we want to be? I do not think that is where we want to be, but where are we going right now? We are going into a nuclear future. We are going there by following the Americans in their lead, and I think a quite aggressive lead, in the Gulf war, and we are going there by following their lead in the North American Air Defence Command agreement. The Norad agreement will tie Canada to the United States in all of its military policies, and its military policies are largely nuclear policies and they include strategic defence initiatives.

It has been five years since we renewed the Norad agreement and it has been five years since we heard a lot of talk about Star Wars and what that would mean in terms of the escalation of the arms race and so on, but it has not gone away. George Bush is still asking for more and more and more money. Last fall we saw the US Congress barter him down and he got, I think, \$2.9 billion. The budget just came out for next year for the United States and he wants \$5 billion for the strategic defence initiative, for Star Wars.

Canada is about to sign another agreement with the United States that could be five years, 10 years, 15 years. It is most likely going to be two to five years but it could be longer, and that is going to marry us once more, ever more tightly, to the US military policies. What is more critical this time than any time before is that we are marrying the United States as it moves into the deployment period for strategic defence initiative. It is quite probable that deployment will start in 1993 or 1994, and once we see the rise in the budget—the budget requests have upped steadily over the last five years and it is being upped again.

That is where Canada is going in terms of its military policies and that is where Canada is going in terms of its international policies. Is that the kind of Canada we want? I do not think it is. When we look at international security, that is not what we want. We want a strong United Nations. We want a non-aligned country. We want Canada to take its rightful place as a peacemaker, not just a peace-keeper but a peacemaker. How do we do that? We move to non-alignment. We pull ourselves back from that marriage

to a superpower, from that marriage to a cold warrior. We set ourselves apart. We set ourselves more in common with the other non-aligned countries. We build those relationships. We look at the infrastructures we have already in place in Canada.

Again, if we use North Bay as an example, North Bay is a command and control centre for Norad. We have a facility here that is Norad central for Canada. What would that mean if we were to become non-aligned? What would that mean if we were to separate ourselves from the American military policy? It would mean that we would convert that facility to an international facility for monitoring and peacekeeping purposes, for monitoring from an international perspective not from a North American perspective, not from a continental perspective. That, I think, is where we want to be.

I have no sense of how much time I have used or how much I have left.

The Chair: I was just going to tell you that you have a couple of minutes left.

Ms Lloyd: In ecological security, if we look nationally at where we want to go, what national issues we have, I think I would use energy as an example and what we want Canada to be doing in terms of energy issues. If we use that as one of the sources of ecological pressures, if we look at energy and energy consumption, Canada right now is the biggest per capita energy user in the world. It is not because we are a northern climate, because there are other northern climates. The Scandinavian countries are way down the list; I am sorry I cannot give you the number. But Canada is number one. We are the biggest energy users. A bigger percentage of our gross national product gets spent on energy than any other country.

If we look at energy issues and where we are going in terms of our energy sources, there are two biggies, for northern Ontario in particular. One is nuclear and one is hydraulic. If we look at nuclear we see the Ontario government quite wisely has declared a moratorium—we do not know for how long—on the nuclear industries, but Canada has not, and that is what we want to see from Canada. We want to see a Canadian government that plays a strong role in regulating the nuclear industries and phasing out the nuclear industries, not in funding them, giving them \$140 million per year just for their advertising budget.

We want to see them taking a strong role in environmental assessments. I will give you another example in the energy field of hydraulics; we look at the James Bay basin as an example of that. At present, within four jurisdictional areas we have three provincial utilities doing major, major hydraulic developments in the James Bay basin, and there is no cumulative assessment. There is only minimal provincial environmental assessment. We have Conawapa in northern Manitoba, we have Moose River basin in northern Ontario and we have Baie James I and II in Quebec. There is no cumulative impact assessment being done whatsoever, and that which is being done province by province is being done in a fractured and separated sense that almost renders those assessments useless.

Those are the directions we need to be going in as a country. As Canada, we need to look at our national responsibilities and national impacts and stresses and address them. I will close there.

2010

The Chair: Thank you very much. We are going to have to move on. We will not be able to have questions, but thanks for your presentation.

It is about 8:10 by my watch and we have an additional six people who have indicated an interest in speaking. We are not going to be able to proceed with the same kind of time frames we have had, because of the time. I am going to suggest that we offer those individuals up to five minutes each to tell us what they will in that time. I realize the time is not long, but it is the best we can do under the circumstances, and I will be ruthless in enforcing that time line. We have other time pressures as well; we have a long bus ride ahead of us to get to our next location. I think we should try to try and accommodate the concerns of the people who have come here to try to speak to us.

TOM PENDERGAST

The Chair: With that in mind, I would call Tom Pendergast.

Mr Pendergast: I will try to be very brief. I have no notes, so I will probably forget half of what I was going to say and that will make me briefer. I did not have a look at the working paper until this afternoon so I did not prepare anything formal, but as this hearing is in my view what Ontario's position should be in relation to Confederation, I wanted, because I am very concerned, because I love Canada and would like to see Canada stay together, to pass on my own personal feelings or reflections on some of the things that have been tearing us apart—and not just tearing us apart over the last two or three years but tearing us apart maybe for the last hundred years. I do not go back that far; I will confine my remarks to a few personal feelings that have to be from my own personal experience.

I grew up in the Maritimes during the 1930s, in Prince Edward Island to be exact. We have a lot of French people in Prince Edward Island. I have to say that as an English-speaking person, I really did grow up with the attitude that French people were down here and the rest of us were up somewhere else, you know? I became aware of this and maybe a little embarrassed about it. I am going to use that word "embarrassed" quite a bit. I was too young to be in the service during the war, but I know that many French people—Acadian French from the Maritimes as well as the people from Quebec—fought side by side with other Canadians during the war, and I thought that maybe we were making some headway as far as understanding each other went.

I was very embarrassed when in 1947 or 1948, I think it was, an incident happened in Moncton, New Brunswick. The Moncton area is probably more than 60% French; not the city itself but the surrounding area. A man from Memramcook, which is just outside of Moncton, came into the city of Moncton with his 11-year-old son and walked down the street in Moncton, and the son spoke to his father in French. The father's reaction was to give him a slap on

the back of the head and say: "Don't speak French here. We might be put in jail or something." That was the kind of scar that that young man suffered, I suppose, and I feel embarrassed about that.

Later on, when I became a little aware of politics, I was also embarrassed when I realized that we had members from Quebec but did not really expect or want them, I guess, to participate. One such member was the one-time mayor of Montreal, Camillien Houde. I might be wrong in this but I did hear that he sat in his seat in the House of Commons when he was elected as a member of Parliament to Canada for one day only and never went back. In my view, I think we as English Canadians really need to think about these things, have to think about the things that have been driving us apart. We are probably responsible, and I think that we knew we were going to have representatives from the province of Quebec but we really did not invite them to participate in the governing of Canada.

I remember being in British Columbia when I was in my early 20s, and that was in the very early 1950s, and I remember hearing something about the goings-on in Ottawa. We did not have television in those days, but some English-speaking Canadians in British Columbia at that time were laughing heartily about how some members from Quebec were bringing up this silly idea of a Canadian flag and how ridiculous it was. That was another example that, as a Canadian, I felt embarrassed about. I felt even then that maybe a Canadian flag was not a bad idea, but to many English Canadians it was laughable that we should even think of a Canadian flag.

I remember years later being in the province of New Brunswick, and I remember in 1960, I think it was, when the first bomb exploded in a mailbox in Montreal—I think the instigators of that were then called the ALQ—I remember the comment in the *Telegraph Journal* in St John that reflected, I suppose, in the writer's view the thinking of most of New Brunswickers.

The comment was made: "Isn't it too bad that we couldn't get all of those French people from Quebec to come down to New Brunswick and see how well we get along with our French neighbours here. We're half French down here and we get along great." But what they meant was, "We get along great as long as they stay in their place." It was almost like the Negroes in the south. That really was true, because it was that same year that Louis Robichaud became the first-ever elected Acadian to be a premier of New Brunswick. There was really quite a change in attitude when people started to hear some French spoken in the streets of Fredericton.

I was embarrassed about those things, and I just want to say that what we need to do as Canadians I think is start to reflect on the things that have driven us apart over the years and try to correct those things. The ladies who spoke here recently talked about the response that they got or the attitudes that were prevalent when they tried to present themselves at Meech Lake, and the thought popped into my mind of blackmail. I am thinking that that is one of the things that in recent years, concurrent with Meech Lake, our leader—I hate to be political about this, but I think that that one person has done more to drive a wedge between

Quebec and the rest of Canada by suggesting, and you can call it blackmail if you want, that the rest of Canada dislikes Quebec, because he did not get his way with Meech Lake.

I think that these are the things that we need to do. Sometimes maybe the media are at fault. For example, I think the media were at fault in overplaying the stomping on a flag in Brockville, and also the reaction that that got in Quebec. It was played over and over in Quebec.

The Chair: If you could sum up—

Mr Pendergast: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Thanks very much. We are not going to be able to have questions because otherwise we will not be able to get through the speakers.

Mr Pendergast: I am just giving you my feelings and I realize there is no need for questions. I would not be able to answer them.

The Chair: I appreciate that. Thank you, sir.

2020

TOM HARRINGTON

The Chair: I call Tom Harrington.

Mr Harrington: I will test myself with a few words by way of preface. Many of today's public are very conscious of leadership, its requirements, its focus and its achievements. Many of the public seem to have lost confidence in the leadership of their political representatives. I suggest that the task of a politician has become a very difficult one. Two reasons are offered to explain this reality.

First, Canadian citizens for one reason or another think of political response in terms of what it will do for them personally rather than what may be good for the community as a whole. When an individual expectation of this nature becomes rampant, the task of a politician is next to impossible.

On the other hand, from the politician's standpoint, the position often becomes one of trying to play Santa Claus to the general public. As a result, elected representatives sometimes resort to ambiguity in speech, incomplete representation of fact and downplaying of the values upon which our nation is built.

So much for introduction. I have three observations and three recommendations.

My first observation regards our standard of living. As a consequence of Canadian affluence for the past 20 years, a somewhat parasitic way of thinking has invaded the minds of our citizens. We tend to negotiate our settlements using the principle, "I want more for doing less." The ultimate in the application of this concept is, "I want the maximum dollar for doing nothing." Can we expect dividends without personal investment?

We also find individuals and small groups invited by some element of leadership to become very possessive and determined in the pursuit of "me benefits," very often with open disregard for the common good or the good of the Canadian people as a whole.

My second point of observation relates to dehumanization. To the degree that there is truth in the first point that people in part have become very selfish as individuals, we

tolerate, if not foster, a degree of dehumanization in people. We see a Canada that permits the slaughter of innocent children for adult convenience. We see disregard for a confident relationship between men and women. As the debate goes on, we see children completely disregarded in the process.

At times our adult community seems to be disarmed by human behaviour patterns that mock family values and ridicule loyalty. We tend to increase our ability to fight fires without realistic search for the arsonist. Is it not factual to say that human indolence without correction will weaken the nation and dehumanize the individual?

A brief quote from Alice in Wonderland: Said Alice to the cat, "Will you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?" Said the cat to Alice, "That depends a good deal on where you want to go." Said Alice to the cat, "I don't much care." Said the cat to Alice, "Then it doesn't matter much which way you go." There are people here in education who might listen a little bit to that comment and many other areas as well.

My third observation relates to communication of the truth. It has become popular, not even a skill, to veil the truth through ambiguity of language when clarity is needed, to speak with silence when response is vital, to use jargon that has little or no meaning. Mr Harris mentioned this morning that the word "bilingual" has many different meanings for many different people. I do not have any difficulty with his statement. How can any Canadian citizen intelligently respond to the phrase "distinct society" until specific meaning is assigned to the word "distinct"? Mr Martin highlighted the need to hear the people as well as the poets. He used slightly different words.

My three recommendations are:

1. The common good; For the common good, and that is the good of all Canadians, the Canadian Constitution must aim itself at protecting the Canadian people as a whole, regardless of age, race, colour or creed. There must be no hidden spots that will put an immigrant citizen or otherwise at a disadvantage in the real world of opportunity. Ontario and Canada must give leadership to its youth by uncompromising protection of human life from conception to natural death.

Only in this way can the corporate soul of a nation be invited to surface. Only in this way can the power of a nation be sensed and supported by all of the citizens. This is not the time for cowards. Our Constitution must protect all citizens from individuals or groups whose sole motivation is the lust for power and control.

2. Realism: Our leaders must put realism before the people, whether it is popular or otherwise. We do have a national debt. We do have immigrant people who must not be put at a disadvantage. We have a need to foster individual talent to give quality service in response to need. We must develop a sense of support for all Canadians. We must have a Constitution for all of the citizens to respect and demand respect for the virtues of loyalty, sacrifice, diligence and mutual support in the realistic business of living.

3. Clarity of expression: Our Constitution must be written and formulated with clarity. There must be a spirit

and a desire to express the spirit of the law in such a way as to promote individual confidence, remove suspicion and place the country in a confident position in relation to one another. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Harrington.

DAVID SCHWARTZMAN

The Chair: I call next David Schwartzman.

Mr Schwartzman: I have been on a disability pension and the only work that I do, which is just cleaning up and tidying up, is the only work I have ever known and it is not a job to support me. It is only a part-time job just for pin money. During those years my main concern has been that those disability pension recipients who require a legal guardian in order to be permitted to be on a pension for that specific handicap need ought not to be treated like a youth if they are not a youth. Such was the case with me, and still is. Well, not quite like a youth, but almost like one.

The only little difference is the only rights that I have as an adult, being allowed to vote, drink—I am not saying I do drink, I am just using that as an example—enter contests which require being 18 and over, and other things, getting entries into shows that require 18 and over. I am not saying I do that. I am just using shows that require 18 and over as an example.

Anyway, one of the things that I dislike about a legal guardianship is that your legal guardian has whole control over your life. I think they should only have a part of control over your life if you are disabled to do the things that—I do not mean physically disabled; I mean disabled in other ways—you would not be able to do yourself.

They should not be treating you like a youth. For example, if you are going out somewhere and you are dressing up in not formal dress, but semi-formal, and your legal guardian tells you, as an adult, tells the disability pension recipient, "I don't like that shirt. It looks ugly. Why don't you wear something else?" That disability recipient has no other choice but to listen to that legal guardian.

2030

That is one prime example of being treated like a youth, and another prime example is, a few years ago, I was invited to the annual sports athletic achievements awards banquet and my legal guardian told me unless I had a chaperone to be with me in the room in which the banquet was being held, to babysit me, I would not be allowed to go.

I know that I am not capable of travelling anywhere I want to go in the world and I need a chaperone to go with me. There are some things I disagree on my disability pension guardianship power and there are other things that I agree on the power my legal guardians have over me. One thing I agree on is not being allowed to travel to places without being chaperoned. That is one thing, because I know that I have not had the experience due to my institutionalization at the Huronia Regional Centre in Orillia, formerly called the Ontario Hospital School. Because of my nine years of institutionalization, especially if you have had 11 years of institutionalization since you are 13 years old, which was the case in my case, I agree that

somebody should be there so I can be under their wing, which I am.

That means if I were invited to Toronto to take part in that banquet, and I am supposed to have a chaperone go with me, so be it. I find nothing wrong with that because I am not independent to travel alone. But once I get there, if my chaperone has not been invited to that banquet and I have, I feel that I should give the chaperone an approximate time as to when the banquet is going to be over and the chaperone can pick me up later. They go and do the town or something in Toronto or watch TV in the hotel room while I am attending the banquet. There is nothing wrong with that. But if my legal guardian says to me, just as he or she would say to a youth 15 or 16 or 17, "No. You have to have the chaperone or babysitter right in that banquet room with you or else you can't go," that is where I am being treated like a youth.

Another thing I am not allowed to do is write letters to politicians concerning any objections I may have about the power that my legal guardian has over me because I am a disability pension recipient. A lot of people, the North Bay and District Association for Community Living, formerly the North Bay and District Association for the Mentally Retarded, have legal guardians too, perhaps not necessarily somebody in their own family. They have what they call an adult protective service worker, which is what I call a legal guardian, but at least they do not have all the power that my legal guardians, who are not the adult protective service workers at the association but my own cousin and her husband, have.

The Chair: I think, Mr Schwartzman, we understand the point that you are making. If you have any final comments, very briefly, because your time is up.

Mr Schwartzman: Yes. I do not know if anybody has an absolute certain answer to my question, but does my legal guardian have any control as to whether or not I could move out of his house or not and get my own apartment?

The Chair: I do not think there is anybody here who can answer that question. What we can do, if you want, if you need some help with those kinds of questions, if you would like to leave your name with our staff, we can pass it on to the appropriate people and somebody can get in touch with you. Okay? If there is a phone number or an address where you can be reached, we can do that.

Mr Schwartzman: All right.

The Chair: Okay? Thanks very much, because we do not have that answer for you right now.

Mr Schwartzman: Neither do you have the answers in regard to violation of other rights or privileges of the other people?

The Chair: I think you need to maybe sit down with somebody who can give you those answers. We are not the people who have those answers.

Mr Schwartzman: Who would?

The Chair: I do not know, but what I am saying to you is we can help you find out.

Mr Bisson: Perhaps his local member.

The Chair: Yes. We can help you find someone who can sit down with you and try to help you.

Mr Schwartzman: Well, my closing comments are—

The Chair: I am sorry, we cannot. We just have to go on to the next speaker. All right?

NORMAN GUERTIN

The Chair: Norm Guertin? Go ahead.

M. Guertin : Premièrement, j'aimerais dire que je suis très capable de m'exprimer soit en français ou en anglais, mais j'ai décidé de donner mon discours en anglais et comme ça tout le monde dans la salle pourra me comprendre. Ça va?

M. le Président : Oui, quand vous voulez.

Mr Guertin: Canadians like Bernadette Morin-Strom are saying that they are outcasts in their own home towns because they speak French. Many are English, yet bilingual, citizens who feel this way also. This is also of no surprise to me and many others, now that we have given lethal permission to our own society to be as discriminatory as it wishes towards its own fellow country builders. There is a cause and effect analogy here. There exists a force in this country that is so discriminatory that it has caused a snowballing effect of bigotry, building to the point of the destruction of the Meech Lake accord.

Throughout past years we have hosted antidiscrimination days across Ontario, as we are right now in March coming up with Don Curry at Canadore College, while at the same time we have allowed bigotry to thrive to the point of ruining the very fabric of our dualistic identity, whole communities opting on a whim of bigotry, racism and/or discrimination for unilingualism in running their towns and cities right before the very eyes and ears of fellow Canadians. All of these communities have been motivated by the same negative and destructive force that I am referring to: the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada, otherwise known as APEC.

Now, really—preserve English? English is a predominant language in Canada, in the world, and the cultural spread is phenomenal. This is not an endangered culture by any means, and allow me to say that I do love English. I read a lot in English, I speak both languages and appreciate that fact. I consider myself an unbiased and open-minded Canadian with a point of view and a vision like anyone else.

How could we, as a society, have allowed this group of negativism to belittle the English as well as French roots of our history? The worst is that APEC claims to represent all of English Canada—at least pretends to, from what I can see—and this is propaganda. I do not believe that we have devolved to this low.

2040

The Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada totally disregards the existence of our two founding European nations of this country. It claims that Canada has been built solely as an English society. My God, let's wake up. The French and English together defended Canada from the United States in the War of 1812 and won. Have we forgotten colonization times, the Seven Years' War,

Treaty of Paris, Quebec Act, Constitutional Act and on and on and on? The French and English fought together as Canadians to free the Netherlands from Nazi occupation in this century. Queen Beatrix of the Netherlands sends us, French and English Canadians alike, thousands of tulips each year to thank us—and not only English Canadians. I could rhyme off a long list of historical events in which we have worked together as a nation.

APEC does not acknowledge this. Their list of propaganda is longer than every Canadian's arms put together. It is the very cause of most of our cultural tensions. Quebec's negative view of the rest of Canada has been generally caused by this minority group and it is the wrong impression that Quebec sees. This organization must be outlawed—this is my view—for the good of all Canada, and I express it with all the love, imagination and passion of a true Canadian.

In a nutshell the following four approaches could help to solve our problems: 1. Acknowledge the two European founding nations of this country by welcoming Canada into federalism with very open arms;

2. Acknowledge our first and foremost founding nation, the North American Indian;

3. Stipulate immigration policies that stress that a criteria of acceptance into our country be their willingness to fit into our national fabric of three founding nations.

4. Last, eliminate bigotry in Canada with very tough policies and laws. The root of this problem is APEC and thus it must be outlawed.

Thank you for allowing me to express my views.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

LLOYD HENNING

The Chair: Could I invite next Lloyd Henning.

Mr Henning: Good evening. The trouble with Canada is me-ism. It is never Canada first, but Quebec, Ontarian, Ukrainian, etc and every little minority that feels they are not getting their fair share of the pie, and usually this means a financial piece.

While I was stationed in the United States a few years ago, and though certainly they have their faults as we all do, one thing I did notice is that it was America first, then a Minnesotan, Norwegian, etc, next.

There is one thing I would like to stress: As much as some people say we are not a melting pot society like the United States but a multicultural one, I beg to differ. As far as I am concerned, we are a melting pot society, an English Canadian melting pot, with the exception of Quebec, which is a French Canadian melting pot.

I blame the governments federally, provincially, past and present for our problems at trying to enforce an unworkable bilingual and multicultural policy on the Canadian people. Not only is it unworkable but extremely costly, and bickering and backbiting caused by it is the major reason for the divisions in our country. Also, it only serves an élite few, especially in bilingualism.

Do not get me wrong. I am not prejudiced or anti-French, but am like a majority of people in wanting a sensible solution to the present painful situation we find ourselves in. Years ago I thought it horrifying that Quebec

would wish to separate. I feel much differently now. I can see where Quebec is coming from, as it is definitely a distinct society. I feel that the other nine provinces plus the territories should try to establish a working sovereignty association with Quebec, but I stress again, it will not work if they do not work together as one in dealing with Quebec. As far as I am concerned this means the language of Quebec is French and the rest of Canada English, with no special treatment given to English in Quebec or to the French in the rest of Canada.

Coming back to multiculturalism, I notice Canadian people, when asked who they are by outsiders, they do not say German Canadian, Italian Canadian, etc, but just Canadian, with the exception of French Canadians, which is as it should be.

Of course, we also have to deal with the natives in a sensible and a reasonable way, so let's stress and emphasize that we are Canadians or French Canadians first, and I stress the word "Canadian." Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

T. J. GAGNON

The Chair: And finally, T. J. Gagnon.

Mr Gagnon: Thank you for allowing me to speak, put my views, but as I see with Quebec, my people all come from there and there is no distinction at all. You say Quebec is distinct; you are insulting me, because you are saying they are better than I am. I go down to Quebec to visit my people and they talk about the English. My mother comes from there; she is Irish. Jim Whelan, who was a speaker in the House in Ottawa, is my uncle. They come from there. And they talk about the Irish. There was a native sat here. He said he was part Irish. If you go to Quebec you will find half of the French people over there, they are all mixed. I happen to have a niece here. She has got four of them in her. She has got some German in her. If we keep this going with Quebec—we are talking about Canadians—instead of uniting Canadians, we are trying to divide them.

That is what I am talking about right now. As myself and my own people there, you take the country. They all came that direction. There was no west coast then and they all immigrated from the east, and if we keep meddling the way it is there, we will be like Europe; we will have all little countries. From here to Waterloo and that, that was all German—from Powassan, Callander. You know, those fellows get up and start theirs and the Chinamen get up—you are talking about language. There should be one working language spoken across the board. Who is going to understand all that? If you had just as many Chinamen here now, they should be able to speak English. It should be the same for Quebec.

The Chair: Sorry, sir. We would prefer that you refer to them either as Chinese Canadians or of Chinese origin, okay?

Mr Gagnon: That should be for one language. When you come into the country, you should live as Canadians. That is the way they immigrated here in the first place. France and England, they were always fighting. They said: "Let's get out of there. We'll come here and make our own country." And that was to live together. So they have been living together ever since. Now, this is political gain. They say: "We'll give you this language, we'll give you that language." That is the politicians. That is the way I see it.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, sir.

All right. That concludes our speakers here in North Bay and it concludes also our hearings in North Bay. Tomorrow we continue our hearings in Orillia and Collingwood.

I want to thank all of those of you people here in the audience who came this evening and those who came earlier in the day and invite you to continue following our proceedings over the parliamentary channel, if you are interested, and if any of you wish to send us any written comments, please feel free to do so. Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 2049.

CONTENTS

Wednesday 13 February 1991

Marcel Noël	C-331
Association Canadienne-française de l'Ontario — Nipissing	C-333
André Lacoste	C-336
Low Income People Involvement of Nipissing	C-339
Anita Corriveau	C-343
Victor Boldt	C-345
Afternoon sitting	C-349
Fédération des femmes canadiennes-françaises, Département d'histoire de l'école secondaire Algonquin	C-349
Jean-Louis Bourdeau	C-350
David Cyr	C-352
L'unité Nipissing secondaire de l'association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-354
Bernard M. Watson	C-356
Ron Lamb	C-358
C. J. Toye	C-360
Arthur Davis	C-361
North Bay Indian Friendship Centre	C-362
Dawson Pratt	C-364
Stanley Cerisano	C-367
Evening sitting	C-370
Ronald Bowes	C-370
Native Citizens' Committee of North Bay	C-371
Raymond Desrosiers	C-373
David Bell	C-375
John Lutes	C-376
Women's Action Committee of Nipissing	C-378
North Bay Peace Alliance, Northwatch	C-382
Tom Pendergast	C-385
Tom Harrington	C-386
David Schwartzman	C-387
Norman Guertin	C-388
Lloyd Henning	C-388
T. J. Gagnon	C-389
Adjournment	C-389

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winner, David (London South NDP)

Substitution: Martin, Tony (Sault Ste Marie NDP) for Ms Harrington**Also taking part:** Harris, Michael D. (Nipissing PC)**Clerk:** Manikel, Tannis**Clerk pro tem:** Brown, Harold**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

CA20N
XC2
-1990
052

GOTTINGER
1-1-1990



C-11 1991

C-11 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Thursday 14 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le jeudi 14 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Thursday 14 February 1991

The committee met at 0936 in the Orillia Opera House, Orillia.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. I want to say, first of all, to the people here in the audience that we are of course the members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are pleased to be here in Orillia this morning to hear the views of the people in this area about the many issues that face us as a province and as a country in the constitutional framework, and to hear what people have to say about what we as a government and as a Legislature should be doing on those issues.

This is an all-party committee and we have representatives from the three political parties at Queen's Park. I want to take a moment to introduce the members of the committee. From the NDP caucus, in addition to myself, we have Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee, David Winninger, Tony Martin and Dan Waters. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer and Steven Offer, and Steven Mahoney will also be joining us shortly, we hope. From the Conservative caucus we have Allan McLean, who is the local member for Simcoe East, this riding, and Charles Harnick.

For the benefit of members of the committee, I have been told that the system here is a little bit different. You need to press the button before you start to speak when you are recognized to ask questions or comment.

Because there is a matinee performance here at the opera house scheduled for 1 o'clock, they have asked us, if possible, to try to complete our session this morning by quarter to one, and we will try to accommodate that. The only way we can do that, given the list of speakers, is twofold: first, we will not be able to add to the list as we have tried to do in other places, and second, I would ask people speaking to us, if they are speaking as individuals, to try to keep their comments within the 10- or 12-minute mark and, as groups, to try to maintain it between 20 and 25 minutes. That will allow us to get through the list within that time.

REFORM PARTY OF CANADA

The Chair: With that, I would call the first speaker this morning: Murray Martin from the Reform Party of Canada, North Simcoe constituency. Again, just press the button there on the microphone, sir.

Mr M. J. Martin: Good morning, Mr Chairman, members of the committee, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Murray Martin. I am an executive member of the Simcoe North constituency of the Reform Party of Canada. I am the media and publicity chairman as well as the constituency co-ordinator for the Medonte and Matchedash townships.

May I wish you success in gathering the information you seek to make this a better Canada for all of us to live in. Equally I wish you Godspeed in delivering this information to the federal government as well as the determination to see your recommendations through.

First, I would like to speak on the fairness of the private sector versus the political sector. There is a widening gap between the Canadian taxpayer and the Canadian politician as to the way they live, the way they receive their pay as well as their pay increases, and how they retire versus that in the private sector.

There is nowhere in the private sector where a person at the age of 38 could have worked for a company for only six years, be fired for incompetence and immediately start collecting a \$40,000-a-year pension indexed to the cost of living, mainly paid by the taxpayers' money. I suggest to this committee that the person would receive an estimated pension payout at age 75 of \$1,602,440. If a 38-year-old person who had only worked six years for a company in the private sector was fired for incompetence, he or she would be lucky if they received a handshake.

This type of pension is out of character and out of line with the private sector. I suggest to you that the people in the private sector must take their chances in the workplace, and we can see no reason why people in the political sector should be treated any different, or should be exempt from laws, general rules or policies that the governing party makes for the people of Canada or in fact for any province within this country.

Therefore, we feel as taxpayers of this country that this commission should investigate the pensions of the average person in the private sector as well as the pensions federal politicians have set up for themselves and pressure the federal government to bring their pensions and the qualifying for such in direct line with the private sector.

Mr Chairman, I suggest to you that the federal government must clean its own house before it indulges itself any further into the tax pockets of the private sector of this country. "Suffer unto me" was a phrase for God to speak, not for federal politicians. Federal politicians were appointed and not anointed, a fact that some apparently have forgotten.

If all the federal politicians in Ontario alone were thrown out of office at the time of the next federal election, it would cost the taxpayers in federal pensions more than \$65 million. If all the politicians from Quebec, some of whom are presently being paid by our tax dollars to take that province out of this country, were defeated or that province separated from Canada, it would cost this country more than \$60 million in pensions. If all the federal politicians except one were defeated in the next election, and that is clearly possible, their pensions, which incidentally

would start immediately after they were rejected, would cost this country more than \$210 million.

The federal politician in this area who was sent to Ottawa 11 years ago would collect, if defeated in the next election, \$1,699,257 by the time he reached 75. A factory that closed in this city last year after a hard fight gave its employees who worked there for 11 years \$5,000 and that is all. This is a shame.

If there is to be equality for all in this country, then we would ask this commission to put pressure on the government and all the politicians to revoke this elaborate pension system of the federal government and to bring it in line with that of the private sector. If the private sector must wait until age 60 or 65, there is no reason why the political sector should not do the same.

Democracy was once described, and I remind you of this, as, if we are equal on one count, we are equal absolutely. Therefore, we ask this commission to seek equality and fairness between the political and private sectors, and in doing so, pressure for the restructuring of the elaborate federal political pensions with qualifying ages of at least 60 years of age, as with the private sector federal retirement pensions.

I would now like to address this committee on the matter of the Senate. This country has just gone through the most deplorable exhibition of political abuse this country has ever known at the hands of 110 unelected senators and the Prime Minister of this country.

The past political parties in power have through political favouritism for political advantage appointed people to the Canadian Senate. Canada became the laughingstock when the unelected Senate took on an unwanted GST bill. To gain advantage, the Prime Minister called upon the Queen of England, who is also unelected, to give him permission to further appoint more unelected people to the Senate for nothing more than political advantage.

This, I suggest to this commission, should alone point out the need for constitutional amendment to the reformed Senate of Canada. The Reform Party of Canada makes it very clear that in this country we need an elected Senate and that Senate be a triple E Senate, a Senate that is elected by the people with equal representation from each of the provinces and territories and fully effective in safeguarding regional interests.

The Reform Party of Canada feels a reformed Senate, if properly constituted, could properly perform the role originally intended for it and alleviate feelings of alienation and remoteness towards national affairs which exist particularly in the less populous regions of Canada and among the minority groups.

We suggest that the Upper House be made up of a total of 108 senators and that each of the provinces being entitled be represented by 10 elected senators and the Yukon and Northwest Territories be represented by four senators. Any province which may be created after this has become law would be represented by its own 10 senators.

We further suggest that the Legislature of the province or territory shall divide the province or territory into senatorial electoral districts, having special regard to geographical

considerations, and determine the number of senators to be chosen from each district.

We further suggest that the Legislature of the province or territory should make laws in relation to procedures for the elections of senators within the province or territory, the financing of elections, the funding of election campaigns and the nominations of candidates.

We suggest that should a vacancy occur in the Senate not more than two years from the date of the election, then such a vacancy be filled through a by-election. The term of a senator elected at a by-election shall be for the unexpired term of the senator whose seat was vacated.

The Reform Party of Canada feel that the defeat of a government bill, motion or resolution in the Senate shall not constitute a vote of non-confidence in the government so as to require the government to resign.

I turn now to the subject of the accountability of members of Parliament to the constituency.

The Reform Party of Canada supports the amendment of the Canada Elections Act to eliminate clauses which place members of Parliament in the position of being beholden to the national party executive or leader rather than to their constituents, such as in the provisions for signing of nomination papers.

The Reform Party supports amendments to the MPs' oath of office such that they swear or affirm fundamental allegiance to their constituencies as well as to the Queen.

The Reform Party supports the principle of allowing constituents a recall procedure against an MP they feel has violated his or her oath of office. To this we ask this commission to bring pressure on the federal government to amend such election clauses so that MPs will be more responsible to those who have elected them.

Our final submission deals with direct democracy. The Reform Party of Canada supports the mechanism of binding referenda on the current government of Canada by a simple majority vote of the electorate, including a simple majority in at least two thirds of the provinces including the territories.

The Reform Party supports voters' initiatives by way of a plebiscite. If 3% or more of the eligible voters of Canada sign a petition to the chief electoral officer requesting that the questions of legislative proposals be put before the people, such questions or legislative proposals should be placed on the ballot at the next general election.

At this time we ask for support on these issues to help make this a better Canada, and we wish you success in the determination in following this through.

0950

Mr Beer: Thank you, Mr Martin, for your presentation and proposals on a number of areas to reform our system. I think it is fair to say that one of the concerns that has been raised as we have been going around the province has been the question of the credibility of governments and indeed of all elected members and how do we make that system more accountable.

I guess one of the questions around how far in a sense to take this concept of referenda and direct democracy is to what extent, when individual members are elected—and I

guess it goes back to Edmund Burke—and what it is as an elected member you owe to your constituents which is certainly to listen to them, to try to serve their needs, but also to use your own talents and ability to deal with issues, some of which can be quite complex.

Is there not a concern here that in a system such as you propose, in effect, we could go the other way where we are sort of burdened in a way by all kinds of referenda that would have to be held and where in fact parliaments or legislatures could be just as frozen into inaction because they could not move for all the different kinds of referenda?

Where do we find a balance between the number of times that between an election we would be going back and asking for people's opinions through this system and where members of the Legislature should be taking that decision because they were elected to do that? Would you see that just certain kinds of issues could go out to referendum or would you think that any issue at all, as long as there was this 3%, could go out?

Mr M. J. Martin: Knowing your past history in Parliament, sir, I know you will well recognize that you are elected by the people, for the people and answerable to the people. Unfortunately in this country there are some politicians who have forgotten this.

There are main issues: the GST the most recent, the hanging bill, abortion. People want a say in this where we do not feel our politicians have been doing so. They tell us we know how they feel but we really do not. If 3% of the total people across this nation should want a plebiscite, we can see no reason why that cannot be placed at the next general election and give the people their say.

You, as an MPP, are responsible to the people who elected you and this is what we want to bring back in, the old style of politics. If you say you were going to vote that way publicly and the people have told you to vote that way, then you are compelled to vote that way. I do not think you should vote on your own. You were put there by the people. I think you will agree with that.

Mr Beer: But as an elected member, I may be part of a group or of a party which has put forward certain proposals. We say, "Look, if elected, we will try to enact certain policies." If that group or party is elected, is there not as well the sense that there is a mandate to proceed to try to enact that? One has the sense that you could reach the point where there is no need for any elected member; we just simply have a series of referenda and pushbuttons. It is the balance there that I am after.

Mr M. J. Martin: I agree with you to one point. You are there to negotiate for the people. But bills like the GST and the hanging bill, the firearm legislation, abortion, I think the people should have a say in that, because it was more than 3% of the people across this country. When you get 3% of the people of this country angry enough to sign a petition, I think you would know the country in general is angry. But I do believe you should negotiate naturally. That is why you were put there.

Mr Bisson: First of all, what I would like to talk about is the principle of recall of a member. We have had this raised before and I understand where you are coming from

because many people out there have a perception, sometimes based on a lot of fact, that politicians are not answering the needs or carrying out the will of the people.

I am a new member. This is the first time I have been elected to the Legislature, and one of the things that I am finding is that often some of the things that are looked at as being clear-cut are sometimes as not as clear-cut as I think they are. Sometimes I have to moderate my position somewhat because of facts that I find out.

In your presentation, you said we need to have a mechanism by which, if members are seen by their constituents as not carrying out what their oath was when they first went into the Legislature, they can be recalled out of the Legislature.

The problem I have with that is that if I, as a politician—let's say you were a politician trying to do the best job possible based on the facts and what is happening—feel that, "Jeez, I can't take a position on this because I know there is a lot of division on this issue. If I say I agree with this particular thing I'm going to have this group mad at me so therefore they may recall me, and if I take the opposite position I am going to have that group mad at me, so therefore I may be recalled," do you not think that in the long run what you are going to end up with are politicians who are hamstrung and not able to do the job they were elected for? That was for making decisions in the best interests of the population based on the needs of the people balanced against the needs of the state and the needs of business.

I further would say that I believe in free enterprise, and I try to imagine seeing that system work within the industrial sector where the employees would turn around and say, "Well, we're going to have a referendum to get rid of the boss." I come out of the industrial sector. I would have loved to have got rid of my boss on many occasions. Do you not see that as a hamstringing procedure?

Mr M. J. Martin: You are correct you would like to get rid of your boss. Our boss is Mr Mulroney. I would like to get rid of him. There must be a procedure whereby to do this. If a politician is responsible to the people—Allan McLean is a very good example of this. He keeps us well-informed in this constituency, well-informed, and he asks the people how things are going. He always has. But when a politician stops doing that—we had two politicians who had to resign out west because they could not agree with the government. Either you agree with them or you are out. Well, they agreed with the people, what the people wanted. That is what we are after.

Mr Bisson: But at the end of the day you do have the choice. You have a member who does the job and informs the people. Obviously he or she is re-elected. That, in a sense, is your referendum, your mechanism.

Mr M. J. Martin: The majority rules, and if the majority wants something, that is what the politician should speak for. He should not be afraid.

The Chair: Mr Martin, I may have missed it in your presentation, but I do not think you mentioned, with respect to the Senate, what you envision as being the term of office of the newly elected Senate.

Mr M. J. Martin: Our party is looking at this. We are looking at a six-year and a three-year. But there are some feelings, and we will not know until April, until the election, our meeting out in Alberta, to come up with an exact policy on that. Right now it sits at six years; elected as three and then the remainder at six.

Mr Offer: On your presentation, specifically with respect to the issue of direct democracy, I think you are the first person, if I recall correctly, who has used the two words, not only referendum but plebiscite. You will know that a plebiscitary type of democracy is one where there is a question put and the answer is merely advisory to the person, whereas a referendum is more of a directive. Basically, my question is: Is there a distinction, as far as you are concerned? Are you in favour of the referendum type of format or a plebiscitary type of democracy, which is advisory?

Second, do you see any difficulties that might arise where there is a piece of legislation which, under your particular scenario, is put towards either a referendum or a plebiscite and deals with minority interests?

Mr M. J. Martin: To answer your first question, referenda, I do favour that. There is no doubt on this. I think you are asking if it could get out of control by small minority groups.

Mr Offer: No. That is not what I am asking. If there is a question in the form of a referendum which is a directive, and the question deals with an aspect of minority interests or minority rights, which just on the basis of numbers might have some difficulty, do you see any difficulties there may be through the use of referenda or plebiscites, a possibility of an obstacle to the advancement of minority interests?

Mr M. J. Martin: No. Really, I do not. They are the people. They need their say. They have to be represented. I see no problem with it. Of course, who knows, down the line? But personally, right now my answer is no.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Martin.

1000

EDWARD C. CARTER

The Chair: I call next Edward Carter.

Mr Carter: We welcome the opportunity to address you today as we share your concern for the future of Canada. It is not my intention to take a great deal of your time to explore the finer details of the fragile structure that currently binds this country together. I would rather speak to a more fundamental philosophy which, in my view, is being neglected by the politicians and citizens of this land.

The dictionary definition of "country" is somewhat constrained in that it speaks of "an extent of territory of common interest." To me, the word "country" goes far beyond that cold dictionary definition and embraces also a state of mind or attitude. If we are to have a country from sea to sea then we must foster a common attitude towards that country which is universal throughout the land.

I accept that this great country is occupied by peoples of differing ethnic origins, languages, cultural and economic

outlooks and other differences, but if we are to have the stability, prosperity and freedom that come from great nationhood then we must all submerge our differences in deference to the common bond that unites us.

The concept of equality and universality is also fundamental to nationhood. We cannot have a nation in which some are more equal than others. We cannot have a nation where some of its citizens do not feel welcome in some regions. We cannot have a nation where some of its regions do not have the same opportunities as other regions. We cannot have a nation unless the concept of country is integral with a man's soul.

With all due respect, our nation's leaders have gone a long way in creating an ideal country, where we enjoy many fundamental rights and freedoms identical from one end of the country to the other. I recognize that much has yet to be done.

During the past few years, it seems that our politicians are being overwhelmed by various pressure groups, each seeking its own narrow self-interest without reference to its neighbours. Some politicians appear to be succumbing to this pressure without a clear idea of the needs of this nation.

A classic example is included in your own publication, *Changing for the Better*, on page 2, where the phrase "celebrate our differences" is used. It would be my submission that in recent history we have been celebrating our differences to such an extent that we are now suffering a hang-over. It would be my further submission that the continual discussion of differences has created a mindset in this country which virtually excludes the notion of nationhood.

It is my view that the continuation of this mindset will set the stage for the balkanization of Canada together with all the perils we now observe in that part of the world and other parts where a consensus of purpose has not been developed. Canada as a country will be replaced by a loose federation of independent states, each with its own destiny, primarily determined by that much greater population to the south and by the strong community now developing in Europe.

Canada has the potential to become one of the great nations of history, a growing nation of opportunity for our youth, a place of refuge for the persecuted, a golden land of national wealth, a great land of freedom, a source of justice for all, an inspiration to the world, and a fount of pride and security for our elderly, but most of all, it can be a country from one end to the other that we can all call, with justifiable pride, home.

If we continue on with the rancour and divisive political scene of recent years, we are never going to live up to Canada's potential. We are going to squander our birthright.

Now is the time for our politicians to act like leaders of a nation and to teach and demonstrate to their electorate the value of one nation in which we are all equal. Give up this divisive notion that Canada is a coalition of special groups. Act with candour and vigour and put country ahead of self. Recognize that the citizens of this country are educated and can comprehend the consequences of failure to come together. Communicate. Get people stirred

up and talking and thinking and believing in this great future we can have working together.

Your committee is but one valuable step in the process.

Above all, our politicians must have the courage to lead, and leadership means getting all the regions of this land going in the same direction. No fundamental change to the structure of this nation can be countenanced until a strong consensus exists all across this land. Do not allow us to be stampeded into unwise and uncertain directions or confusion will destroy the fragile bonds we currently have.

In conclusion, Mr Chairman, we wish to thank you and your committee for the opportunity to appear and to leave with you, in summary, four words: Canada First-Canada Now.

The Chair: I think I echo the feelings of the committee members in saying that we too realize that our process and this committee's existence is but one step in a continuing process.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation. Again, I think one of the things that has come forward during our hearings is that a number of people have spoken about the need to have a strong national identity, a strong sense of our country, a strong central government. But at the same time, we have also had people saying, "We want to have more control in our communities, however defined, over many of the things that happen to us." I suppose the previous speaker, in talking about some of the changes he saw in terms of the way the Senate worked, in terms of direct democracy, was also speaking about something of a conflict, where people want to have more direct control and yet want to have a strong centre.

I do not want to use Quebec as the example: let's use the west, Alberta, British Columbia. How do you see reflecting what I think would be strong, legitimate regional interests that have been with us through history and have been a part of Canada, or do you see those as being able to be represented none the less within a strong Canada? How do we allow for that expression within the sort of vision you have put forward?

Mr Carter: I understand what you are saying. The example from out west is actually one that was in my mind when I wrote this, because I was out there during the last oil crisis, went out to ski, and it was rather disturbing to see bumper stickers saying, "Let those eastern bastards freeze in the dark." I have relatives in the west. I know a bit about the attitude out there.

I think the problem is that we have talked so much about differences. You, again, are talking about differences and you are trying to give some credibility to the fact that there should be differences. I recognize there are differences, but they should be submerged. We need to change our attitude towards the way we look at this. We need to take pride in this country and from the fisherman in Newfoundland to the fisherman on the west coast and the Inuit in the north we should all be thinking: "Look, we're Canadians. We're not from the west. We're not from the east. We're Canadians." Just because they have the oil and the man in the east has the fish, let's all sit down. We can sit down and talk about it, just like we are sitting down and

talking now. We need to talk, and then I think that things would come together much better.

But the politicians need to change their attitude towards the way they are talking. In your own document, as I pointed out, you use this term "celebrate our differences." We should not be celebrating our differences. We should be celebrating our sameness and work together. If you change your attitude, change your approach and the way you speak about it, then I would think you would come much more together. Let's start from where we can work together. Sure, everybody is a little different. You and I are different. We can all sort out our various things, but do not make a big deal about it.

Mr Bisson: To me it seems that the strength of a democracy is the difference within that democracy so people can look at options from different ways. One of the strengths I see in Canada, quite frankly, is that we do have differences. I agree with the paper, I do celebrate the differences. I guess that is where we part company.

I think it is important for a democracy to grow that we do look at things in a different way. Frankly, it scares me a little if we are saying we all have to be walking down the same road and we all have to be looking at things in the same way. Do you not think that is somewhat dangerous, not allowing change to happen in a much more open way? Do you not see that affecting change in any way?

Mr Carter: No. I do not. When you talked about everybody being different, Canada is no different than a hockey team or a baseball team. We are all players but we are all players on the same team. Let's talk about the team, let's not talk about the individuals.

Mr Bisson: The point is that there is a league when you play hockey and there are different teams.

Mr Carter: Well, the politicians are supposed to be the league here.

Mr Bisson: That is the country.

The Chair: I guess the trick is where we find that balance between respecting each other's differences and all being on that same course which I think you call Canada, which is what brings us together as Canadians. That is partly what this process is also aimed at, to try to help us get a deeper understanding of it.

Mr Carter: I think people can respect their differences without celebrating them.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you.

1010

ALLIANCE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF ENGLISH IN CANADA, HURONIA BRANCH

The Chair: I call next Wallace Reid from the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada.

Mr Reid: I welcome you to the Sunshine City. Just do not look outside today. May I apologize—it is not my duty to do so—for having you meet in these rather cosy but cramped quarters? I am sure there could have been something larger provided in Orillia, knowing the intense interest in our area and what is going on in our country. We could have met in Al McLean's office. It is maybe a bit of

an exaggeration, but we would have almost had as much room.

It is a privilege for me to represent the Huronia branch of the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada in coming before you to present some of our views regarding the future of our province and of our great country, Canada.

We agree with the Premier of Ontario in his preface or open letter in the discussion paper that our country faces a tremendous challenge that we believe we can, together, find a way to solve our problems. They are not insurmountable.

We come faced with some sobering difficulties, but we do not come in abject fearfulness or sorrow, but with positive thoughts and knowledge that Canada can and will continue to be a great country, and we hope to be part of that process.

We come, if I may say so, in a spirit of vindication and some pride, as we no longer hear the media and some politicians making a hue and cry about those doddering old people, some of whom are racists and rednecked bigots who do not represent the majority view of English-speaking Canadians. Now the media has changed its tune and speaks about the majority of Canadians who demand change and are no longer satisfied with what is taking place in our country. A provincial election has taken place and what changes have come about? Just ask a former Premier.

I trust you will forgive us for that little departure from positive suggestions for Canadian unity, but it does tie in with present reality. APEC's main concern has been and still is the language issue: official bilingualism and what it is doing to Canada's unity, the unfairness of application and the horrendous cost, on a federal level \$1.6 million per day. We know that programs in Ontario have cost billions of dollars but the government to date has never given out an overall figure.

Further, the former Liberal government of Ontario in varying ways brought in measures that almost made Ontario officially bilingual. In fact, the former Premier expressed the personal opinion that he would at some time like to see Ontario officially bilingual.

The same government brought in Bill 8 and drew up the designated bilingual areas of Ontario, all this with less than 50% of the members of the Legislature's approval, only 55 members there.

Now we are faced with the demands of the province of Quebec for a distinct society recognition or even sovereignty-association or perhaps separation. Do you, as political leaders, really believe that if any of these situations come about the rest of Canada will still blithely go along with official bilingualism? Not likely.

The government of Canada has already given Quebec some rights the other provinces do not have. In the latest round of negotiations, immigration rights were approved. I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, is it right for members of Parliament from Quebec to sit in on discussions affecting the same rights which would affect other provinces in Canada, or should they absent themselves from such discussions?

APEC does not oppose unofficial bilingualism and the use of French by the francophone community or the learning

of other languages; we encourage it. It is not a political organization but an organized group of different political persuasions endeavouring to make political parties realize that official bilingualism is divisive and discriminatory. We believe the majority of English-speaking Canadians are of the same mind and will support efforts to do away with it.

This is not an exercise in hate against the francophone people of Ontario and Canada, simply a belief and knowledge that official bilingualism is dividing rather than uniting Canada.

Having had the privilege of associating with francophones over many years, from local friends to serving alongside them in the army in the Second World War, as an employee of the post office and working with them, and through union participation at conventions in various parts of Canada, I have always found them, as individuals, like most other Canadians, personable, friendly, doing their best to do their jobs and get along with others. I believe they have always had a strong sense of their ties and culture, and because of that were much more inclined to act together in contrast to the looseness among English-speaking Canadians.

When the federal government began promoting official bilingualism, beginning with the Pearson era, we witnessed that fact in Quebec and throughout Canada. It has led in some measure to some of the problems we have today.

Five years ago, when I retired from the post office, there was a problem in the Penetanguishene area of this county with regard to education. I asked a friend there, a francophone who held a position of public trust in that community, what the problem was. He responded, "Wally, instigators were brought in to arouse discontent among the francophone population and demand a separate French high school despite the fact that previously they had got along just fine." These were his words and his thoughts.

Later, a television documentary by Hana Gartner from the Fifth Estate outlined the divisions that developed in the community, indeed dividing the families. These were francophone families. It was a very revealing look at the problem and they are still having problems.

Some provincial governments such as Ontario with the previous Liberal government, have aggravated the process by bringing in measures to support the cause to the point of alarm among English-speaking communities. For instance, in Ontario we find that provincial licences, documents, maps, departmental letterheads, even this discussion paper that we have that we are presently discussing, are all produced in a bilingual format. Has there not been any public input from English-speaking Ontarians? Of course not. This is in contrast to Quebec where it is still all in French—who wants bilingualism?

Perhaps the government should take a close look at what has happened in the field of letter appeals by charitable organizations for funds. A year or so ago most of these letters of appeal were coming in a bilingual format, perhaps aided and pushed by government help in printing costs. The net result was a rejection by the public and a drop in funds received.

Today one receives very few bilingual letters. Most have reverted to English for English-speaking persons, perhaps with a notation in French to check the proper square if one wishes to receive the correspondence in French. The organizations have learned very quickly indeed. In fact yesterday I received one from one of my favourite charities. Whereas last year it was a bilingual mishmash, it is English this year for English-speaking people with the notation, "If you want it in French, just mark the square."

One wonders why these steps were taken in a province with only a 5.4% francophone population. That is the figure given on page 16 of the discussion paper. The cost of all these steps must be enormous. We are not given facts. Translation alone runs from 30 to 50 cents a word; \$2,000 for basic translation at a conference. These figures were from a newspaper report just out last week. Our riding MPP, Allan McLean, once reported on what it cost him to have a letter translated, and I believe that was around \$70.

The same report from the newspaper I have just quoted also stated that some provincial government ministries have produced thousands of pamphlets in French and then stuck them in a warehouse when there was no demand for them. Again, I am just calling on what the report said. Would it not at least be more sensible to produce these articles in a bilingual form, or French if necessary, in the percentages required, 5.4%, instead of 100%? Oh well, it is only money. Who cares?

One could go on at length to give examples to back up our position for the discontinuance of official bilingualism as a method of bringing Canada together. They would be factual findings on what is taking place.

One such program is French immersion schooling, a very costly, contentious program with some very serious flaws. Parents for English and/or core French report that one in every five children who are enrolled drop out before grade 8. In high school, 77% do not complete the program. The stress factor in some children and parents becomes very high. Again, that is from their report. May I ask what happens to French immersion if indeed Quebec separates from Canada?

1020

I should hope too that Ontario politicians and government leaders are keeping a close watch on what is taking place at the present time. The federal government recently contributed \$20 million to assist in the building of a glass plant in Quebec, while they tell us two glass plants in Ontario are having difficulties staying open. Also, tenders are being called for the architectural work on a new National Archives building to be built in Quebec, not far from Ottawa. Should a halt be called to this type of thing or at least until Quebec makes up its mind on what it wants to do?

Another very divisive program by federal and provincial governments is the multiculturalism policy. While this has not been a program actively opposed by APEC, we the executive of Huronia branch strongly voice our opposition to it. It does absolutely nothing to unite Canadians. Rather, it places them in groups seeking to retain their former language and culture. Do we want immigrants to come to Canada to become Canadians or simply to come and

establish themselves as overseas branches of various nationalities?

Canadians need no policy to remind us of our ethnic backgrounds. Those of us who served in the Second World War quickly learned of the Canadian mosaic, but we were just proud to be called Canadians and it mattered not where your ancestors came from.

It seems governments have developed a type of mentality that when people come to Canada as immigrants, we should change our heritage to suit theirs, instead of allowing them to adapt to our customs. Not only does officialdom ignore Canadian heritage; it encourages new immigrants to preserve their culture and language and assists them with grants to do this, again, a very costly and unnecessary and divisive program.

We suggest that if you feel a majority of the people in Ontario support official bilingualism and multiculturalism, then have a referendum on these subjects and see how they respond. The suggestion has been made before and never acted on. It must be that the results are foreseeable. In this area, a number of townships and Coldwater village asked that question on a municipal ballot dealing with a question, are you in favour of the municipality conducting its business only in English? The results were overwhelmingly in favour.

There are many issues to consider in seeking to change Canada for the better. Solving the problems of dealing with aboriginal rights has to be one of them and the most foremost. Economics, interprovincial trade, closer co-operation between the provinces, help for those affected by the recession and free trade, these are Canada-wide problems. I am sure that there are lots of provincial problems to tackle as well. Education and health care are but two that come to mind.

However, important as these matters are, Canada cannot go forward until the decision by Quebec to remain or depart is reached and settled by all concerned. Perhaps you might take insight from a bit of humour wherein a lady decided to go cross-country skiing. Upon reaching the area she decided she needed to limber up a bit before hitting the trail, so she placed her hands on the top of the car trunk, raised her legs in order to flex her muscles and a man and a young girl passed by just then and she heard the girl say, "Daddy, aren't you going to help her push?"

We think province and country really do need a push in the right direction and we hope Ontarians and all Canadians persevere in pushing Ontario and Canada ahead, and we are certain they will.

Thank you very much, members of the committee. It certainly must be a trial for you to go around the province hearing all these people, various people speak, especially someone like me.

The Chair: It is all, Mr Reid, part of the process that I think we have embarked upon, to try to hear the views of as many people as possible, as different as those views might be. There are a few questions.

Mr Harnick: I appreciate where your group stands and I am not agreeing necessarily with the positions you take. I am pleased to see that on page 2 of your brief you

have specifically stated that you do not oppose unofficial bilingualism and the use of French by the francophone community. I think that is certainly an indication of a level of tolerance by your organization.

What I am interested in is the idea when you talk about a community like Coldwater, which I understand is a primarily anglophone community, so they decide that they really do not need French services and we can accept that. Penetanguishene, on the other hand, is primarily a francophone community, and do not tell me it is not because I have been a long-time resident of the area, a part-time resident but I have been there for a long time. You will never convince me it is not a francophone community so do not try. The fact of the matter is that if I take your statement on page 2 in terms of that community being a francophone community, you do not disagree that French services should be available there?

Mr Reid: Pardon me? I do not agree that French services should be available?

Mr Harnick: No, you do not disagree.

Mr Reid: No.

Mr Harnick: Of course, and in a sense because of that this admission you have just made to me, really Bill 8 is not a bill that is totally unsatisfactory to your organization in that it stands for the use and provision of French-language services where the numbers warrant. Is that correct?

Mr Reid: I would say so. I have read Bill 8 and reread it and reread it again and it comes down to me as rather a very high-handed effort to make that the rule.

Mr Harnick: It may need some fine-tuning.

Mr Reid: I would say so.

Mr Harnick: It may need some fine-tuning. I am not going to comment on that one way or the other, but basically we have an understanding in this little discussion we are having now that APEC does not dispute the philosophy espoused in Bill 8 that French-language services should be available where the numbers warrant.

Mr Reid: No, I think their major concern is that in doing so you make it discriminatory for others to seek those positions. I think that is their main concern.

Mr Harnick: But then, just for the record, you do not have a problem with the bill providing the services are where the numbers warrant.

Mr Reid: I would not think so.

Ms Churley: I am a bit concerned, to say the least. On page 2 you quote a francophone telling you that instigators were brought in to raise discontent. We have certainly heard over the past week and a couple of days from a lot of francophones in northern and northwestern and northeastern Ontario, and we have heard a lot of pain and a lot of hurt and a lot of humiliation. I am sure you have heard about it too. We have certainly heard that there is a sense out there that people are looking at this too economically, that we have to think about how humans feel and how their culture and they are valued in this society.

Certainly it is my belief that there is a misconception, that we are considered to be getting along as long as nobody in a

minority position rocks the boat. I can speak about that from a female perspective in trying to make it in a man's world and struggling with that fight. I think it is the same for francophones and many other minorities. I would like to know how you feel or why you feel that majorities rule. Do you not think that if we have a country where we do referendums, and where the majority rules because actually it is mostly male and white—white males still have the majority rule in many ways—that we are going to have a kind of country that is going to make us even more divisive, because so many minorities will be left out of the process, so to speak, and that in the long run it will cost us even a whole lot more money to try and constantly deal with the kinds of problems that arise from that?

Mr Reid: No, I do not think that is entirely true. As I have said, over the years I have dealt with francophones in many ways and I too have grieved with them when there were outside delegates from Quebec. We were at conventions in other areas and they could not make themselves understood in some circumstances. I have had the same problems in Quebec.

But to go on to the question, if you are asking me about referendums and treading down the minorities, I do not believe that would be true at all. I think we can still deal in a fair and square manner with all Canadians as Canadians, and if you had a referendum, surely the ladies, the women, would have a voice in that referendum too.

1030

Mr Offer: Mr Reid, in your response to a question posed by Mr Harnick you indicated that you do not disagree with the philosophy of Bill 8, which is French-language services in areas where numbers warrant. I think it is no surprise that the organization you are representing has espoused absolutely the opposite view, that it is opposed to the philosophy of Bill 8. I am wondering, Mr Reid, if you could tell us which position it is. Is it the APEC position which you are espousing or the position in terms of the response to Mr Harnick's question that you are stating?

Mr Reid: I thought I gave a personal opinion to Mr Harnick on that. I know that APEC, as an organization, opposes it strongly and I thought I said to Mr Harnick that I believe it is because of discrimination they perceive in job positions particularly. Again, if you are speaking about where services are warranted, that brings in a whole new kettle of fish. For instance, in the new high school in Penetang, they are serving the whole county of Simcoe, I believe, at the moment. Again, is that warranted, for a whole county to be served by one—I am just throwing that out to you, but I do not believe that—I think APEC's main concern with Bill 8 especially was setting up a bureaucracy and a position where discrimination becomes very effective. That is just my personal opinion.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for sharing your views with us this morning, Mr Reid. I am sure you would agree and support the importance of equality of services for those who speak English in Quebec. I am sure you would agree that those people have rights there and I am sure you then must extrapolate that to Ontario and agree that francophones in Ontario must also have that same right.

It would seem clear to me that this is the position your organization should take, that if you care about the anglophone minority within Quebec, then you must also care about the francophone community in Ontario. I would like to know what you think about that.

Mr Reid: Again, I am perhaps answering more on my own personal views. I agree that francophones in Ontario should and must have some rights, but how far do you carry those rights then, Mr Malkowski? I do not know. At the moment it does not seem that there is going to be any compromise between Quebec's position and what is going to take place in the future. I believe in francophone rights, but you would have to interpret what you mean by francophone rights. If they were like what we have been viewing in the past or something a little better, I would certainly go along with that.

The Chair: I just want to say one other comment, Mr Reid, and that is that you referred in your presentation to people from different countries coming here and setting up—I think you used the phrase—overseas branches of various nationalities. I just ask you and your organization to think about that because certainly, as an Italian Canadian, my experience is that people who have come to this country from various countries do think of themselves as Canadians and are very different from people in whatever native country they may have come from. I think that there is a lot of discussion and thinking that needs to go on between people of all backgrounds along those questions as well.

Mr Reid: I appreciate what you have said, sir, and I go along with you 100%. You know, for instance, it bothers me that Toronto has been designated as a bilingual centre and you have 500,000 Italians and only 38,000 francophones. I have nothing that I would argue against what you have said at all and I hope I have not presented a different view in my presentation as far as—all I am saying is that you do not single out little groups and say, "Do you want to be Italian Canadians? Do you want to be German Canadians," and so on. We all want to be Canadians. You know very well that you are an Italian Canadian and proud of it.

The Chair: Thank you, sir.

ERIC GERHARD BUCHOLZ

The Chair: I call next Eric Gerhard Bucholz. Please come to the table. Go ahead.

Mr Bucholz: As you have probably noticed, I am a person who is underage and therefore cannot vote, yet I have taken a great interest in politics and in this particular situation I am very concerned about the direction in which this country is going. I am very pleased, Mr Chairman, to have the opportunity today to talk to you about where I think Canada should go.

Canada, for me, is the best country in the whole world. It was built on the dream of John Macdonald, a dream of diversity and uniting different people from sea to sea. And part of this reasoning is that when we look for common values, perhaps the value we all share is the tolerance for different people in the country. But unfortunately in recent years, there has been an awful lot of division. In Quebec

there has been an awful lot of division. The French want to be accepted there. The British institutions seem somewhat in jeopardy, they say. The aboriginal people are pushing for self-government and the foreign people are concerned about racial discrimination.

Therefore, what you must do in Canada to maintain the diversity, you need a strong federal government. You must control and keep the interest groups on track in Ottawa because they are our reason for remaining Canadian. If you look back in history you will note that that is the reason why people were Canadian, because they could preserve their identity. The aboriginal, the native people were Canadian because they were well-respected by the British. The British wanted to be Canadian because they wanted to have ties with the motherland. The French wanted to be Canadian because they could speak French. And many Europeans and people of different races wanted to be Canadian because in Canada they were able to maintain their cultural identity.

So they are our best interests too, and each group of people that is different is another reason for remaining Canadian. I enjoy that diversity, but unchecked they can get off track and let their economic interests get in the way of the preservation of their identity. Therefore, Mr Rae's role as the Premier of Ontario, a very influential province, is to avoid the extremities and keep—even in Ontario there is a lot of diversity and he must therefore keep the people on track and avoid the extremities and employ moderation so that we may work all for the betterment.

It has been said that Quebec should be allowed to go its own way, and I think Mr Rae has an obligation to the people of this province that if Quebec wants to leave he should let them leave. But at the same time, it is up to Quebec to decide. If they can share in our aspirations and our reasoning that the French fact in Quebec is for the betterment of Canada—but they must not let their economic interest take precedence over the preservation of their identity—then they can stay. But if they cannot share that dream, then they should leave, and any other interest group should either leave or simply not become Canadian.

1040

We would probably be more united in that case without them, for the people who do share that tolerance and reasoning for being Canadian. And constitutional talks should probably simmer down or should not be concluded until the citizens in Canada have gotten a chance to employ forums such as this to exercise their views and to employ more reasoning and less emotion, so they will be able to understand the betterment of the other parties involved in Canada.

Mr Rae's role, therefore, should be ensuring that the people do not resort to extremity and employ moderation and tolerance. In Canada, we build our values on peace, liberty and justice, but we should also build them on the historical facts too, and find the reasoning why we are Canadian, like tolerance and diversity. British, French, aboriginal and foreign institutions all have a role to play in the Canadian identity and makeup, and equality cannot be overstressed. None the less, the majority of Canadians must keep their identity, and when the government resorts

to such things as taking the Lord's Prayer out of the public schools, that is not what I call in the best interests of tolerance for the majority of Canadians.

We must also recognize other things of Canadian identity—the snow, the forests, the hockey, the fur trade—and understand them as well as the fundamental historical component.

In summary, if we are to find out the common values, it should be in Canada's best interest to look at the history and find out why these interest groups wanted to become Canadian.

I am very appreciative of the opportunity I had today to speak. I understand that my opinion is one of many that Canadians share, and some disagree with, but I can now feel some satisfaction that I helped shape a new Canada for future generations to come. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I appreciate your presentation.

Mr Bisson: First, I want to thank you on behalf of the committee, because I think it is awfully important that we as adults and we as a committee and we as a government in the community hear what our young people are saying, because in the end you have the trust of picking up the pieces or carrying on whatever we are doing. I want to demonstrate something. When we say we need to be all the same, we need to be marching down the same road—Gary is a member of our Legislature. As you understand, Gary is not able to speak, and speaks a very different language, American sign language. ASL, for the information of people out there, is actually not English. It is a language of its own. So when Gary was elected, we decided we would recognize within our own little community, which is the Legislature, another language, which is ASL.

Can I ask the interpreter to stop, please? He is now excluded. We are not able to gather his thoughts, we are not able to allow him to proceed. I am getting emotional obviously, but I really value what this man has to bring to this Legislature. When we talk about excluding people, what we are saying is: "We don't value your opinion. We don't want you to share. We don't want you to participate in this country." And that hurts me and it hurts many Canadians. Can you restart, please?

So I think it is important that we recognize our minorities. Yes, Canada is different. We started this country by saying we did not want to be the melting pot. We wanted to gather, we wanted to share, we wanted to interchange with other people in this country to make it a better place. By recognizing our differences and allowing people such as Gary, whom I value, to be able to contribute to our Legislature and to our province, I think makes us a much better place. I just ask you to think about that.

Mr Bucholz: That is precisely what I am saying.

Mr Bisson: I realize that.

Mr Harnick: Eric, you made a statement I would like you to try to clarify for us. You said Quebec should stay if they share our aspirations. I do not know what you mean by "our" aspirations, but what I put to you is this. Should we not, as provinces outside of Quebec, also be prepared to share and respect some of their aspirations as well? I say

that to you in the spirit of the tolerance to which you referred during the course of your presentation. If you could clarify those statements for us, I would appreciate that.

Mr Bucholz: I do share the tolerance of Quebec or I do share in the aspirations of Quebec, because the French fact is one of the components of Canadian survival, it is one of the many, and I share in their identity. But if you take a look at the whole structure of Quebec, you will notice that there are underprivileged areas, like the Maritimes and the native people, that are not getting that needed assistance, but I do notice an awful lot of economic benefits going to Quebec. Perhaps they are taking more of a look at their economic aspirations and confusing them with preservation of their identity. They are confusing the two, I strongly believe, and if they are going to let their economic interests prevail over the preservation of their identity, then they are going to put the Atlantic provinces and the native people at a disadvantage, I feel, and that is why we must have equality. I share in Quebec's aspirations, but I think that if they let their economic preservations prevail they have enough weight that they could deny the Atlantic and the native people and various foreign groups the opportunity to have these needed economic benefits.

Mr Beer: Thank you very much for your presentation. It seems to me that the root of what you have been saying is the key value that we share as Canadians and need to continue to share, this one of tolerance. I wonder if you might share with us what your sense, in terms of your own generation, is regarding the future of the country and, in particular, how we go about finding within our country the ability to recognize and to respect linguistic rights, respect aboriginal rights, all the while within the context of being Canadians. Are you optimistic in terms of your own personal vision in the discussions with your fellow students? Do you think this is something we are going to be able to achieve? What do you see as you look from your position right now at those of us who are in positions of leadership? Is this something we are going to be able to do?

Mr Bucholz: First, the main centre in the debate here is about Quebec. That is a major issue. And my generation follows the average English Canadian, and I think the average politician has leaned on a general consensus, Trudeau's bilingualism type of thing. Federally, at least, I do not find very many Tory politicians who can deny that Canada is bilingual. I think that is a slap in the face of tolerance to say that Alberta is bilingual when the franco minority there is very minute. My generation is saying that maybe on a provincial level there is—the general consensus might be better, but they look very sceptically at politicians and think that they are too much on the general consensus. There are not too many people who stand up for the lost cause, that Canada is not bilingual and they have lost faith in very many politicians in that respect.

That is not uncommon for this present generation of Canadians. I think they feel the same way. They feel there are too few politicians who can make their stance against some such things as the Meech Lake accord or something

like that, and they have kind of lost faith because they are always following the partisan interests. Another thing, too, is that they follow the general consensus. You do not find many politicians, for instance, opposing abolishing the Lord's Prayer in the schools, yet these people are perhaps from the same group of people ethnically that is quite opposed to abolishing the Lord's Prayer in the public schools. So they view sceptically, let's just say that. It is a very sceptical view.

The Chair: We will end there. Thanks very much.

WILLIAM GEARING

1050

The Chair: William Gearing, go ahead.

Mr Gearing: I have only a few minutes, so I will restrict my comments to just three of the questions you raised about Canada's future.

First, I must say I hesitated about coming before this committee. By the way, I hope you have my remarks in front of you; I gave you copies. The reason for my hesitation is that I wondered if you really intend to listen to Canadians who come before you and to those who cannot, and what you will recommend if a majority disagree with your views.

I go on to give you a few reasons why I think that, but I am going to pass on because I can see there is a time problem here.

I will say that I am encouraged by your questions and your comments, and perhaps the scepticism I express here about the committee may not be justified. However, I would like to go on to actual topics you have raised.

One of your topics has to do with the west, the north and the Atlantic region. I congratulate you for that, because constitutional talks have virtually ignored the needs of these regions while most attention has focused on Quebec. It is essential that we recognize that national unity requires fairness to all regions. The most important means of achieving fairness is through a triple E Senate, which means elected, effective and equal, and which is demanded by more and more people living in the outer regions.

At this point I must tell you that I am on the executive of the local Reform Party, which you have already heard from. I am speaking for myself now, but I want to make clear my position.

Those who are bothered by the equality concept must learn to understand the viewpoint and needs of the smaller provinces. They must realize that we are more than a majority rule democracy. Because of our vastness we are also a federation, and we must never forget that. We must remember that keeping this country together depends on successful federalism, which in turn requires fairness to all regions. We must remember that to secure fair treatment the less populous provinces need equal representation in the Senate. We should remember that Ontario will continue to be well-protected by our large representation in the House of Commons.

We need to remember, also, that other democratic federations, such as Australia and the United States, have an upper chamber based on equal representation. This arrangement works well for them and will for us. Therefore,

one of the greatest contributions the Ontario government could make towards a more united Canada would be to endorse the principle of the triple E Senate.

A second topic we were invited to comment on is the role of the English- and French-language communities in Canada. My response is that we must restore harmony between these communities, but to do so we will have to travel a different road from the one we have been on. I believe government language policies should be based on the following principles.

We must stop defining Canada as being based on two founding races, English and French. This definition offends aboriginals and people of other ethnic origins, especially in the west, where over 70% of the population is of neither French nor English origin. Instead, we must think of ourselves as unhyphenated Canadians who should be treated alike regardless of race, language or culture.

We must trash the myth that Canada is a bilingual country. The 1982 Constitution recognizes an official status for English and French in some respects, but it does not state that Canada is bilingual. To do so would be absurd when over 80% of the population continues to speak one language.

Language is the lifeblood of a nation. Like the Québécois, Canadians in English-speaking Canada have an emotional need to live exclusively in our own language, if we so choose, while still being eligible for all positions in government, except translator. We do not wish to be governed by an exclusive, bilingual élite. Nor do we intend to submit meekly to ridicule hurled at us for holding sentiments that are natural, legitimate and universal.

It is not the majority of Canadians who should become bilingual. It is the anglophone minority in Quebec and the francophone minority elsewhere who have an obligation to become bilingual and function in the majority language, except for communications among themselves. This is expected of second-generation immigrants and should be a responsibility expected of francophones and anglophones as well.

Language policies must be fair to the majority as well as the minority. It is unjust that many Canadians are being denied jobs or promotions because they are not bilingual. Fluency in both official languages and other languages should be encouraged, but most Canadians are fluent in only one language and should not be penalized for it. The determining factor should be merit, not language ability, and especially not the mother tongue of the applicant.

There would be less tension about language if we were to devise more imaginative programs to solve the problem of being fair to the minority and the majority. For example—and I am referring here more to the federal government, where there are large numbers of both language groups—essential federal services could be offered by separate parallel units in which English-speaking employees serve the public in English while French-speaking employees serve francophones in French. Members of each group could work in their own language and be promoted to higher positions. Bilingual ability would be required only of translators and members of the minority group who aspire to senior positions. The obligation to become bilingual

would be on the minority, where it belongs, not on the majority.

Goodwill is a two-way street and is not encouraged by charges of bigotry against those who express concern about language problems. Bigotry exists, certainly, in all groups, but many supporters of official bilingualism are all too willing to engage in pious posturing about tolerance while avoiding the issues of excessive costs and unfair treatment of Canadians who are not bilingual. They are all too fond of alleging bigotry in an attempt to intimidate people who raise these questions. Those who profess tolerance are often most intolerant and abusive towards fellow citizens with different views.

One final remark about language. I believe no provincial government has the right to declare a province to be officially bilingual unless it has been mandated to do so by the voters in a referendum.

Turning to the questions about Quebec, I hope we can keep this country together and I include Quebec in this aspiration. However, Quebec may not stay. Emotionally, I have not yet accepted this possibility, but events unfolding in Quebec may force me and all Canadians to come to terms with the political reality of separation.

Over the years we have asked, what does Quebec want?, and we have tried to make amends for past injustices. Unfortunately, we have fallen into the habit of letting Quebec politicians take the initiative while we react by trying to appease them as they demand more and more. Instead, we should work towards the building of a new and better Canada, with or without Quebec.

The futility of attempting to appease Quebec has been demonstrated by the Meech Lake scheming and the Allaire report, which spells out where the Quebec government would have taken us in order to uphold Quebec's distinctiveness. The only difference is that the Allaire report wants Quebec to seize these powers now rather than through a gradual process of wearing Canadians down.

1100

The proposals currently coming out of Quebec would trivialize the Canadian government and establish Quebec as an autonomous state having the financial and economic benefits of an association with Canada. Meanwhile, Quebec MPs would continue to sit in the Canadian Parliament, where they would still have a powerful influence on decisions affecting Canada.

This is rather like a marriage separation in which the two partners continue living in separate rooms in the same house, but one gets the keys, a separate entrance and a veto over the behaviour of the other partner, who gets to pay the mortgage and the bills.

The time has come to ask instead, "What kind of Canada do we want?" We should establish our own vision of Canada, and then place the onus on Quebec to decide if the two visions are compatible.

Who speaks for Canada? We cannot trust Brian Mulroney to speak for us because he is from Quebec, as is much of his caucus. Both he and Jean Chrétien have a conflict of interest. Now, I am saying that I realize that Brian Mulroney does speak for Canada, or says he does, but he is negotiating with Quebec on a lot of things and he

is also speaking for Quebec. He cannot help but do so. Nor can we trust the NDP, which is inclined to sell Canada short in an effort to win votes in Quebec. All three old-line parties participated in the effort to blackmail and bamboozle us into accepting Meech Lake. Most Canadians were opposed, but the attempt to impose the deal from the top down almost succeeded.

We must do two things to secure genuine participation by the people in Constitution-making. First, we need to hold regional conventions at which elected delegates will draw up proposals for a new Constitution. This should be followed by a national constitutional convention. Second, the new Constitution, or amendments to the old one, should be voted on by the people in a referendum.

In conclusion, I believe Canadians have had enough of government from the top down. Who speaks for Canada? We should speak for ourselves and let the people decide.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Gearing. I think just on some of the comments in the opening part of your presentation about how we as a committee are going to deal with the wide range of views that we have been hearing, and no doubt will continue to hear, that obviously is probably going to be the most difficult part of our work in the end.

Obviously we do come as individuals and as members of political parties to this process with some views and some positions, but I think we are also trying very hard as a committee to continue to build consensus among ourselves but also to try to broaden that consensus out by listening to what people have to say and incorporating the kind of things that we are hearing into the kind of reports and general areas of recommendations that we might put forward to the Legislature and the government. We recognize that a lot more discussion needs to go on to allow that process to give us an even clearer picture of the views of the public in Ontario on those important issues.

Mr Gearing: I appreciate that and that is why I left out a paragraph after hearing some of the preceding comments.

The Chair: All right. We have time for just the one question. Mr Winner.

Mr Winner: Just following on what Mr Chairman has said, we just completed two weeks travelling around the north and what we have heard is a very distinct and repeated theme, and that is that we have three founding nations: the French, the English and our first nations, the natives of Canada.

You said earlier in your paper that you had some difficulty with defining the nation in terms of two founding nations, French and English, because that would exclude native people, and then you went on to suggest that first-generation Canadians have an obligation to learn English, which is the majority language, and gradually you focused more and more on the English as a pre-eminent nation of Canada. It would seem to me—and I was a second-generation Canadian—that learning English seemed a very natural thing, and learning French seemed a natural thing to want to do, and perhaps ultimately learning native languages is a natural thing to do, and all of these predilections can exist in harmony and they do not have to be to the exclusion one of the other.

So I would ask you, in taking this position that English-speaking Canadians have a right to elect to only want to speak English and only want to deal with the public in English and that official bilingualism somehow denies that inalienable right, are you not taking a very narrow view that could also be extended to our first nations, our native people, and say, "Well, they are a very small minority and why should we extend services to them in their own native languages?" notwithstanding the fact that they were here before the English?

Mr Gearing: First of all, I would extend it to them in their own language, if that is what they wished.

Mr Bisson: But you would not to French?

Mr Gearing: Oh, yes, I would to the French too. I did not say that. In fact, I suggested how it might be done better than it is being done right now.

First of all, I want to go back to what you said at the beginning. I think it is a mistake, though, to be thinking in terms of English and French as the founding nations, and even if you add the aboriginals, then you get all the multi-cultural groups that are right now demanding the same sort of thing. It is beginning to balkanize us. I think we have to think of ourselves as Canadians, unhyphenated Canadians. For many of us in a major part of the country, the predominant language or the official language, if you like, will be English. That does not make it, though, an English culture, not England in the sense of England overseas or anything like that. As with the Americans, their language is English. Sometimes they say, "Speak American," but it is English.

Mr Winninger: So what you are suggesting is, even native Canadians have to become unhyphenated Canadians.

Mr Gearing: I think we should all think of ourselves as Canadians first, and I find that some of the native peoples, only some, are starting to talk in terms of they are not even Canadians.

Mr Winninger: And that bothers you, does it not?

Mr Gearing: Yes. I think we are all Canadians, Canadians first. Then within that we may have various divisions, if you like, but I would certainly agree that, having been here first, the native Canadians perhaps have a priority more than anybody else. But the problem with that is you may be extending it to more and more groups. I would say that is as far as I would go.

But you do not understand. I did not say we should not have French services. I got the impression you thought at one point I was against French services.

Mr Winninger: I just had the impression that you did not feel that English Canadians should be obliged to provide services in French.

Mr Gearing: No. I felt that an English Canadian or English-speaking Canadian should be able to speak in his own language and function right up to the top levels of government, which is not true now in the federal government, and if you wish, I can give you personal examples, not just some that I have read, but people I know who are discriminated against.

The Chair: I think we will have to end there. Thank you very much, Mr Gearing.

COLLEEN COONEY

The Chair: I call next Colleen Cooney.

Mrs Cooney: Aniin, bonjour, greetings, Mr Chairman, members of the committee.

First, I wish to express my appreciation for having been given the opportunity to address this committee. It is important that many voices be heard. Prime Minister Brian Mulroney two days ago stated that Ottawa does not always know best. I think we could probably get quick consensus on that.

I welcome this committee to Orillia. I come to speak to you as a fourth-generation descendant of boat people who travelled from Ireland in the middle of the last century. I am grateful for the reception into this country and I appreciate the sacrifices of our gracious hosts who shared this land with all the peoples who arrived on these shores.

We have at this present time the opportunity to reflect, to put into words our thoughts on who we are, to look at the Canada we have become. This is a time to find out if our actions are an accurate reflection of our vision of Canada and now is the time to dream of the Canada we want to become. We must dream the dream of Canada. As we express our individual dreams, we must begin to share with each other to form a common dream. We are Canada. Our actions reflect who we are. It is vital to make sure that our actions match our dream.

1110

We must look at our story as it unfolds in the story of the universe. We have become fragmented. Our story now is inadequate for meeting the survival demands of this present situation. In this age of instant communication we have a tremendous opportunity to have a common dream. As we share our dreams with each other, we will begin to visualize the Canada we wish to become.

I have a dream of Canada. I dream of a Canada that is compassionate. I dream of the people of Canada who look at each other with the eyes of compassion, of people who will listen to each other with the mind and the heart, who will respect each other and learn to be compassionate in actions. I dream of a people in Canada who are compassionate with all the animals, insects, plants in the ecosystem of this great land. I dream of a Canada which will be an example to the rest of the world on how to live together, respecting differences and finding solutions to our problems.

I am grateful for many programs we already have. I am proud that I live in a country which cares enough to have a health program. It would be very difficult for me personally to live in a country where a person could die from a simple health problem simply because he or she could not afford to pay. Canada is already compassionate.

As we look at the story of Canada, the first nation people welcoming the Europeans, we see pure tragedy on one side, unmeasured gain on the other, but our story has not yet been completed. It is up to us now to dream. We boat people have been the cause of much suffering. We have taken over much land, have been the cause of much pollution. First nation people were one of the freest of peoples on earth and now they have become one of the most confined in more than one way. We have broken the

rhythm of their development. We must now step aside to let the deeper qualities of first nation tradition develop from within. Thomas Berry, a well-respected man of wisdom says that: "Our first duty is to see that the Indians dwelling here have land, the resources and the independence they need to be themselves. This involves radical abandonment of the policy of assimilation." Now is the time for all of us to dream, to develop attitudes which will make the next few centuries of our life together a creative period for first nation people.

As we learn to share our dreams with each other, I think that we need to look at the environment and the format we choose for this activity. The very structure of our technological civilization prevents us from communicating in depth with first nation people. Keith Spicer, chairman of the Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future, has stated in a letter released one month ago to Prime Minister Brian Mulroney that the forum could not provide a thorough review of aboriginal issues and does not have the capacity to listen to and reflect aboriginal concerns adequately. This concern needs to be listened to and addressed. As we begin to be more sensitive to others and to listen to the message with compassion, we will grow in understanding and respect. Our dream of Canada will evolve as we listen to each other's dreams.

I cannot speak for first nation people. But I have heard them speak of being caretakers of Mother Earth. I have heard my Chippewa friends say that Mother Earth is very sick; she is bleeding. As Europeans, we seem to have the philosophy that we are lords with dominion over all other living beings. First nation people have a sense of communion with nature. There are a great many lessons for us to be learned. We see evidence every day of the destruction we have caused. Our industries have failed to create a better world. We need now to listen to those who have a sense of oneness with all things. We need to walk in the moccasins of first nation people. Their moccasins have soft soles, and you can feel the ground under every step.

Let us look at the recent clashes involving first nation people:

(1) The Haida of British Columbia standing in the path of logging machines which were intending to clear-cut ancient forests;

(2) The Lubicon of northern Alberta and the Temagami Anishnabai of northern Ontario trying to protect ancient lands;

(3) The Mohawks of Akwasasne trying to protect lands. It is interesting to note that it was reported in the Toronto Globe and Mail that the federal government, after promising to buy the disputed land to give to the Mohawks, bought the wrong land—it bought swamp land;

(4) The Mi'kmaq and the Maliseet of Nova Scotia trying to protect their hunting and fishing rights; and

(5) The Innu of Labrador battling the low-level flights by jet fighters over their formerly quiet and peaceful land.

What are first people trying to tell us? Let's try listening with our minds and our hearts. Let's dream together of a Canada which is compassionate. Let us never again summon the army to settle our differences.

I want my first nation sisters and brothers to know that there are many, many of us boat people who strongly disapprove of the way we are acting. We share your dream.

A recent study by the Canadian centre of international PEN, in co-operation with the faculty of law at the University of Toronto, reports that Canada is failing to meet its obligations to first nation people under international law. The federal government announced in February 1990 cuts in funding to native communications programs. This must be addressed.

I dream of a Canada in which there is compassion, dialogue, friendship, tolerance, justice and equality for all. I dream of a Canada which will have first nation people well represented in Parliament and in the Senate.

This is a decisive moment in our story. We need to recognize our failure, bemoan the past, and move on to new healings—healing of our relationships, healing of Mother Earth.

Recently, as we were climbing an icy slope on the sand dunes of Lake Michigan, a friend of mine, who is an Oneida Indian, climbed ahead of me and held out his hand to help me so I would not slip. I was struck at that moment at how symbolic an act that was. I reached out to take his hand, and we both arrived at the top of the hill. Thank you. Meegwetch. Merci beaucoup.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Cooney. We have time for one, possibly two questions.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation, which was not only full of interesting thoughts but the way you expressed it was at times particularly poetic. On the last page you talk about dreaming of a Canada "which will have first nation people well represented in Parliament and in the Senate." There was a suggestion, I believe out of Nova Scotia recently during the leadership for the Conservative Party, that perhaps they should consider designating a seat or two seats for the native people who live in Nova Scotia. Do you think we are going to have to look at some of those kinds of changes to institutions in order for us to better understand and better work with the first nations, in terms of Parliament?

Mrs C. Cooney: I am not a politician and I do not have any answers, but I think we need to sit down with first nation people and listen. I think we have to take time to listen, and listen with the mind and the heart. They will know.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Seeing no other questions, we will end there.

1120

BONNIE AINSWORTH

The Chair: I call next Bonnie Ainsworth.

Mrs Ainsworth: I appreciate the opportunity of being able to be here this morning, and I would like to try and answer some of your questions. I would like to say that I believe the values we share as Canadians are that Canadians have always shared pride and prided ourselves in our individual freedoms and founded our institutions on the principle of equal opportunity and justice for all. We believe in

democracy, we believe in personal heritage, and we believe in honesty and fiscal responsibility.

I find it very interesting that, with few exceptions, it would appear that Premier Robert Bourassa has adopted the Confederation of Regions platform. It might interest you to know that the Reform Party, headed by Preston Manning, in fact separated from the Confederation of Regions party, taking with it almost all viewpoints of the COR constitution and therefore has an almost identical platform.

I am not here today representing the Confederation of Regions platform. I do not say it is perfect, but I sincerely feel that the COR vision of Canada could save our country. This land was settled by regions over a period of 400 years. Each region is different in many ways. Therefore, each region must be allowed to build and develop on the basis of its own strengths, aspirations, differences and regional characteristics. After each region has determined its own objectives and direction, then, at that time, a confederation of regions may be entered into. Each region must decide and agree to what political power each region will have and also agree what areas of responsibility they will allow the federal government.

I know when I first was introduced to this concept, it seemed pretty off the wall to me. I have always been an ardent Canadian and a strong federalist, but Canada is not working, and we are going to lose it. The triple E Senate comes from the COR constitution, equal representation by regions, elected from the people of each region and effective with defined constitutional powers. Canada's first nation people should have equal representation in this House and elect their own representatives.

COR is also committed to the use of referendum on major public issues—federally, some would be abortion, capital punishment, free trade, constitutional matters, etc—because it is the people who have to live with, and under, these laws. Provincially, it might be Sunday shopping, no-fault insurance, Bill 8, young offenders act and so on. Referendum and representative recall are also part of the COR policy.

I do not want to spend any more time on COR, because there are a few more points I would like to make, but I would suggest that your committee investigate this concept. I am sure that in this time of crisis in our country the Confederation of Regions party founder, Elmer Knutson of Edmonton, will come and speak to you. You will find any such interview a very positive and productive experience. He is truly a person of common sense and vision.

I will leave a copy of an article I brought with the clerk. I would just like to read little parts of it, if you do not mind. The article was in the *Globe and Mail*, 5 August 1988. Before I read this, I would like you just to think how many times you have heard people say: "Bilingualism works. Look at Belgium."

The article is headed "Belgium Law Aims to Cool Dutch-French Power Tussles." It says: "Belgium's National Assembly adopted a law and devolution yesterday intended to end historical tensions between Dutch- and French-language groups that have caused chronic political instability. Tensions between the communities have repeat-

edly paralysed the central government and brought down numerous coalitions. The law approved by the Senate will transfer full or limited responsibility for education, public works, economic policy, external trade and scientific research to regions and communities. The devolution process is planned to take effect in three phases. When the process is completed, about 45% of all public funds will be under the control of the three administrative regions: Dutch-speaking Flanders, francophone Wallonia and bilingual Brussels."

We are not the first country to have lived through this.

Canadians are, for the most part, very proud people. And David Peterson said we are getting cranky. If our country and our province as an integral part are to prosper as they should, then we must ensure a truly democratic form of government as a right of all citizens with all levels of government being responsive to the needs and the desires of the people all across the nation. The main cause of indifference by elected representatives is excessive adherence to party and caucus solidarity.

You have asked me what the roles of English and French languages should be in Canada. Personally, I would not expect to work and live in Quebec without speaking French, but I have very serious problems with the language legislation, Bills 101 and 178, in that province. I do, however, feel they will be relaxed in a new Confederation.

In Ontario, Canadians have been labelled, offended, degraded, slandered and otherwise ignored. I find it totally unacceptable to be labelled an anglophone, if that is what I am. The label, as far as I know, has never been given any clear definition. The only thing I have been able to find out is that there is another group of Canadians called allophones. I think this is degrading and disgusting, and I resent it even more because I know the only reason I wear this label is that so you can identify francophones.

I think we have heard just about all we want to hear in this province about francophones. They are nice people, and I am truly sorry that they are afraid they will not feel comfortable. But they are a 5% minority in this province. How can they expect to live and work here and not expect to speak English?

I think Bill 8 is totally ridiculous, and its implementation procedure is enough to boggle your mind. It is, in my opinion, nothing less than backdoor official bilingualism for Ontario, disguised for the moment as French-language services. I find it upsetting that this bill was passed into law in this province while only 44% of our elected representatives were present, and no recorded vote was taken. You call that democracy?

God bless Mr Shymko for pointing out to the Speaker that several of the MPPs who were absent understood absolutely no French, and who asked, in recognition of the historic nature of this bill, if it would be possible to make an exception in the procedures they normally followed. Normally, there would be no English translation of remarks made in the House. These remarks in French were made exclusively by the members who participated in the debates during the second and third readings. Could we have the debates of the time of the second and third readings of Bill 8 translated into English for anglophone citizens of

the province and for the members who do not understand French and who, being absent, did not have the opportunity to hear the translation? If I had time, I would read you the whole Hansard report from that day. It is just incredible.

I am not going to go on about this any more. But because of the remarks Mr Beer has made to another person bemoaning Bill 8, and because I spent hours and hours and dollar after dollar trying to inform the population of this province of the unfair legislation that was being foisted upon them, I feel I have a right to quote one of your colleagues in Queen's Park. The gentleman's name is Bob Runciman. His comment, when asked about Bill 8: "There was no meaningful debate, no reference to standing committee to take place, what the implementations of the legislation might mean in Ontario, and no recorded vote was taken. I think there has been too much effort and attempt by this government to cover up this issue to have any meaningful public discussion about what is happening in terms of language services in the province, the cost implications, social implications." Mr Runciman says, "Bill 8 as the wholesale extension of the French language service in Ontario represents a horrendous waste of tax dollars, whose passage in 1986 marked one of the blackest days in the history of the Canadian Legislature."

No wonder we are cranky. How can we be expected to have any confidence in this Canadian style of democracy?

1130

However, in closing I would like to say that the Constitution of a country is for the future, not the past. I would also like to recommend to Premier Rae that unless he plans on following the same path of extinction travelled by Bill Davis and his Tories and David Peterson and his Liberals, he had better start listening to the people of Ontario. I would like to remind him that there is a municipal election in this province in November. I think it would be more than appropriate and even cost-effective, and it would certainly stop a lot of—

I just feel that as a Canadian, if I could have a say in what is happening—I feel that as a Canadian Canadian I am being disenfranchised in my own country. I feel I do not have any status because I do not have a culture. Now they tell me my heritage is being moved to Quebec. I wish they would wait until my heritage is moved to Quebec before Quebec decides if it is going to separate or not.

I think it is really unfair that the people have been put in the place of having to somehow sound like they do not like French people or that they do not like people from other countries. Canadian Canadians are wonderful and we are very tolerant and we feel there is room for everybody, but you cannot have special status, distinct people in this country. It just will not work. Canadians have to pull together and operate as an equal entity. Thank you.

The Chair: I know a number of people would like to ask questions, but time, unfortunately, is pressing. We will be able to allow one.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for sharing your important views with us on the committee. I would just like to follow up. You mentioned briefly the importance of values. I think somewhere, if I got this right, that you are talking

about unequal opportunity and democracy. Do you believe in those two things? If this is true, the COR party—you were talking about COR—may be an example for Canada in terms of Confederation. You want to have a referendum on language rights. I do not know what the COR position is on that. I am getting confused whose values you are representing, COR's or yourself as an individual or as a Canadian. If you could just clarify that?

Mrs Ainsworth: I think I made it clear that I was not here today to represent COR policies. Because of the close coalition on what the Allaire report is coming out with and the position that Quebec seems to be taking, I can clearly see, knowing so much about the Confederation of Regions party platform, that it would be a productive vehicle to enter into some sort of communication with that province. I really think regional development is necessary. I think it would be feasible and I think it would strongly support a better Canada.

The Chair: If we had more time we would be able to get into some of the other issues you raised, particularly the—you kept repeating the words "Canadian Canadian" which, if I understood correctly, seemed to imply to me that you were suggesting that there is one group of Canadians that is more Canadian than others.

Mrs Ainsworth: Yes, I think those past, maybe, seventh generation. I do not think they know what they are any more. My great-grandmother was a French-Canadian Indian. Where do I fit into your culture? You all have your dances and your dresses, but I would like to let you know that it is my plate you are dancing around on.

The Chair: I think it is all of our plate, and that is what we are trying to evolve into.

Mrs Ainsworth: Yes, it is.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

WILLIAM COONEY

The Chair: I call next Bill Cooney, please?

Mr Cooney: I am very grateful for this opportunity. Regardless of who first discovered it, Canada is a very large country, first inhabited by the aboriginal people, then colonized by two European tribes, the English and the French. Later, numbers arrived from almost every nook and cranny of the globe. This presents a set of problems, but also opportunities.

The first European tribes that came here, the English and the French, were themselves from states that are tribal in composition. England has its Irish, Scots, Welsh and Anglo tribes, France has its Breton, Normans, the tribes of Alsace and a host of others. This fact is evident throughout Europe. Spain has several tribes of great ethnic and linguistic differences; Belgium, Switzerland, Yugoslavia are cases in point. The German tribe is found in several national states, and I will not even try to describe the Balkans. Historically, these tribal differences have led to tension. Some are resolved; others seem to have a life of their own and continue over centuries.

There are many tensions in Canada, often described in general as east-west. Regionalism is a Canadian fact of life; so is the English-French tension. This is perceived as

a problem or series of problems. Now, what one normally does with a problem is to answer it. "Answer" is a strong Germanic word and implies an end to the problem; for example, two plus two and you get four. I do not see any definitive end to many of Canada's problems. However, the discussion guide speaks of a celebration of differences, and I like that.

Fortunately, in English, there is another word that addresses "problem." It is the word "solution," a softer, Latin-based word that implies a solvent. If you have a blocked drain, you apply a solvent, the water moves. The drain may at some future time become clogged again, but at least for the present the problem is solved and life goes on. It is along this line that I see Canada's future evolving. I feel some confidence that with work of commissions like this, political will and a generous spirit among all citizens, a peaceful evolution of our affairs can be moved forward.

If you will permit me two short anecdotes, I will leave the language tensions to more capable hands and move on to a proposal of solution. At the time of the Korean war, I was trained as an infantry officer. A significant part of the training took place at la Citadelle in Quebec City. Almost all of the French-speaking young men were bilingual. In spite of high school French courses, very few from Ontario were. However, as the weeks rolled on, many of us could at least read the papers and menus, enjoy the movies and converse with the men from Quebec with animation and pleasure. Many lasting friendships were formed. When a contingent of British soldiers arrived, we from Ontario understood them quite well, but the men from Quebec were baffled by the Scottish burr and this, we found, was a source of amusement for all of us.

Years later, I spent several years in South America. From time to time I would meet someone from Quebec. We felt happy in a strange land to meet someone from home, yet aside from introductions and a few stock phrases, we were, more often than not, saddened to find that any serious conversation had to be conducted in Spanish.

Now for a modest proposal. It is a very observable fact that some politicians in the world, usually dictator types, will seize upon, for example, a border incident. This draws attention away from their own domestic problems and diverts it elsewhere. Somewhat along this line, I feel that if we could focus on a larger and more important problem, present tensions might be reduced to size. A common effort to meet the larger problem could produce a willingness to work together towards a rather inspiring goal.

The first element of this larger problem is the environment. Our air, our land, our water are in danger. Words like "greenhouse effect," "ozone depletion," "acid rain," are all well-known and worrisome. Since the Second World War, rampant consumerism has produced horror stories centred around issues such as chemical spraying, forestry monoculture, and the disposal of many items that we will not, or in any case, do not use. This last item will be very familiar to all of you who know well the problems facing the greater Toronto area and the efforts being made to meet them.

1140

The second element of the larger problem is that of the aboriginal land claims and self-government. There is a lot of unfinished business here for all Canadians. The principle is simple: Only Indian people can design systems for Indians. Anything other than that is assimilation. I do not think assimilation is desirable nor practical. The alchemy—the melting pot theory—has not worked in other countries, so why should it work here? We rather promote multiculturalism. Are native North Americans capable of such an enterprise? Recent developments among the Navajo in the United States say yes. In Canada, the example of Chief Billy Diamond in dealing with phase 1, the James Bay hydroelectric project, indicates to me the answer is yes.

It has been proposed that at some point, first nation people would make ideal environmental police. The two elements of the larger problem, as I see it, the environment and native rights, are interconnected. Given the native respect for air, land, water, their emphasis on human dignity and freedom, they are natural for the job. Indian contributions to the world are enormous. An Indian food, the potato, revolutionized the world's cuisine. Countries like Ireland, Germany, Russia were able to grow and prosper, free from the periodic famines that had beset their history. And what would Italy be without the tomato? The story of corn, beans, tobacco, cotton, tapioca, each in itself merits a book; and this is the short list. Indians discovered and utilized rubber—another story. In medicine, the discovery of quinine and a battery of heart-healing substances is well known. As travellers, they cut out the most efficient routes across the continent. They invented the canoe, a most efficient means of transport and a vital element, particularly, in the history of Canada. They were able, where necessary, to construct buildings that are earthquake-proof. The solid base can still be seen, where the European-built structures are in ruins.

In politics, they had enormous influence on our North American style of democracy. The debt the framers of the US Constitution owed to the Iroquois band councils is acknowledged and well known. European nobility did not hand to us on a platter democracy as we know it. The native American council, with its insistence on freedom, individual dignity, respect for individual opinion and the need for consensus provided an immediate and practical model on to which rather aristocratic and intellectual ideas were grafted. This list could go on at great length.

So that is my proposal. In the course of your hearings and from the mass of information you will have at your disposal, public awareness can be fostered and concrete political steps taken to find solutions. Our daily actions and attitudes can change where this is indicated.

May I close with a story? One month ago I heard that next year, 1992, the 500th anniversary of Columbus's discovery of America, a group of North American natives are planning an expedition to Europe to discover Spain. If I were made an honorary band member, I have volunteered to go and act as interpreter.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Cooney. Are there any questions? All right.

KEITH EVANS

The Chair: I call next Keith Evans.

Mr Evans: I appreciate this opportunity to present opinions relative to the persistent degradation and decay of my country and my province.

The adoption of the melting pot theory for Canada's growth is one of our prime problems. Our traditional values have been eroded to virtually zero in order not to offend, and utopian socialism combined with the negative worship of tolerance to the point of abject stupidity has sapped the marrow of our backbone. Canada has become a near bore, neither one thing nor another, a spice, or Spicer, gone bland.

Your panel has continually asked speakers: "How can we implement this? How do we know what to do?," etc. Apparently, after the euphoria of your election to the status of an MPP wore off, you forgot where you got your support. You now toe the party line in order to get appointments, to obtain your perks, to ensure you maintain party backing. Listen to your constituents. Do not just use the various associations, groups and voters as free labour or voting centres. Take their views back to the party caucus and ensure these views are carefully considered and acted upon. Please do not use forums such as this one to philosophize, moralize and expound on your own party platforms. You are elected and well paid to do a job, not your service groups nor your local associations nor the multitude of free voluntary groups to fulfil your job.

Mr Rae stated on page 1 of your booklet, "This is a time for politicians to rise above partisan interests," and "We'll be good listeners." Sounds good, but is it fact or fiction? Many of us who had worked voluntarily for years in federal, provincial and municipal politics have become deadened to hollow phrases, the hypocrisy, the deceitful assumption of virtue, and are now prepared to divest ourselves of our old political ties and work even harder for those who will return to the basics and values we cherish.

The British North America Act was designed to create a strong union, to shape a federal government with wide authority and local governments with limited powers. It also expounded that the unwritten concepts of the act would be developed in Parliament to meet changing requirements—not a written, stilted Constitution subject to devious self-interest, legal interpretations or the Supreme Court.

Since 1867, Canada has served with pride and honour in two world wars and other conflicts, despite the bungs of our politicians and their fear of defeat at the polls if they enacted conscription. If you wish to enjoy all the benefits of Canada, then you are obligated to protect and honour these traditions.

I am proud to relate that my grandfather volunteered 6 December 1915 to serve with the 142nd Battalion, London's Own, Canadian Expeditionary Force, and served at Vimy Ridge, was wounded and medically discharged 21 July 1918. My father volunteered 24 January 1940 to serve in the Royal Canadian Air Force and transferred to the Royal Canadian Artillery, discharged 9 July, 1946. Our daughter and son-in-law volunteered for our air force. Both are warrant officers. The latter is currently flying on

the Hercules transport planes from Lahr, Germany, to the Persian Gulf. As an aside, today is his birthday. Our hearts are with him.

Our family is not founded on war-mongering, but it has been and is prepared to accept its responsibilities. We do not suffer pacifism lightly. We are painfully aware of the divisive atmosphere created by self-seeking interests within our Dominion and within the superstructure of our forces.

I sincerely trust that the current Ontario government does not share nor intend to promote the unacceptable, pacifistic approach to Canada's participation in the Gulf war as its NDP federal counterparts have expounded. I am confident our current government is aware of the great number of Canadians who are prepared and proud to defend the principles of freedom as required by our historical heritage and membership in the United Nations.

1150

I do not want a new Canada. Your booklet prompts a multitude of thoughts which open many in-depth discussion areas, which require a myriad of supporting facts in order to provide realistic, logical and supportable answers. I repeat: I do not want a new Canada. I want a return to the values that created and held us together, with possible surgery to cure current ills.

Ontario can become a model of honesty by:

(1) Restricting socialist giveaways which pander to the look-after-me syndrome which is creating a modern-day Roman mob at massive expense. I draw this to your attention: our town here, Orillia, population 24,000 people; social services alone cost \$200 million a year. The social services employ over 2,000 people, almost 10% of our population.

(2) Restricting massive expenditures on non-essentials such as the implementation of the French Language Services Act. This is a prime area of divisiveness in Ontario and great expense that our taxpayers cannot afford.

(3) Restricting payoffs to party hacks and defeated politicians. The latest example is David Peterson, to be paid \$61,000 per year pension, plus severance pay of \$43,374. He was fired because of incompetence. Also, his staff will receive approximately \$700,000 in severance benefits.

(4) Eliminate the hypocrisy and grandstand posturing re environmental concerns. It appears the only areas where rules are enforced are against the small fry. We are taxed, but funds have to be obtained through a lottery, and I understand not one tree has been planted yet. Take a look at Hagersville after the fire.

(5) Eliminate government intervention in the automotive insurance business. Free enterprise should be retained. The concept of government insurance is not only ludicrous but also self-contradictory. The government cannot run an efficient, cost-conscious government, let alone a low-cost, efficient, complex business. I do not want to subsidize poor, accident-prone and/or devil-can-pay drivers. Driving is not a mandatory birthright, but earned by an intelligent and responsible driver. If a vehicle owner is refused insurance due to his driving record, under the free enterprise system his rights to drive legally will be removed. I have lost another freedom, freedom of choice, not only re the

carrier, but also my coverages with one carrier. Your plan has already resulted in Safeco Insurance closing, with a loss of 300 jobs. Do we now turn it over to Co-operators insurance?

(6) Eliminate the hypocrisy of allowing Ontario Hydro to squander multimillions of dollars through non-efficient, ecologically dangerous energy-powered generators which fail. Metro Toronto today is forced into paying \$2 million for a consultant's report to give to Ontario Hydro to show where Ontario Hydro is failing Toronto. Fantastic. With Ontario's vast water resources, cheap hydro can be generated and be pollution-free. If Quebec, Newfoundland and Labrador can do it, surely the bright lights in Ontario should be able to utilize our natural resources to the benefit of Ontario. Our Orillia Water, Light and Power Commission is self-sufficient to 40% of our needs.

Meech Lake was correctly defeated. Thank God for Premier Wells and Elijah Harper.

Now we face a regurgitation of appeasement demands and spoiled-child ideology via the ravings of the Parti québécois and the Liberals headed by Robert Bourassa.

Confederation was not developed to pander to local whims or tantrums. Quebec was guaranteed its rights of religion and language, among other things, but not the ultimate subjugation of the rest of Canada via the enforcement of artificial devices of the bi-bi commission and its successors. Now that these seeds of discontent have been sown and appeasement rather than discipline is the vogue, Quebecers are being led to the doors of separation by self-seeking opportunists.

Sovereignty association is not acceptable. Quebec is either in or out. If Quebec is in, then it will abide by the rulings of a strong central government, as long as that government is truly representative of the majority and not represented by a bunch of flunkies who are afraid for their jobs and cater to blackmail. If Quebec is out, then out it goes. All amenities cease. Outstanding bills are paid, including their portion of the national debt, federal assets returned and any other gifts that were showered on Quebec returned to Canada. The federal government et al will then repatriate to Quebec all disciples of discontent to allow them to create their own nation and negotiate with Canada on an equal basis.

Ontario does not need Bill 8. Ontario does not need implementation of enforced improvements or extension of French-language services. An open mind is required, not that shown by Gilles Pouliot, "I can assure they will not be weakened."

Ontario cannot afford either the financial extravagance or the social costs of Premier Rae's advocacy of an officially bilingual Ontario.

I strongly suggest that the Ontario government, both current and immediate future, because this may have just been a burp, learn from the disaster heaped on Peterson due to his support of Bourassa, Meech Lake and his implementation of many facets of Bill 8. Do not play games with the silent majority. Do not play the Quebec game against the federal government in order to advance or obtain questionable benefits for Ontario.

The recession is an unfortunate economic cycle with no real fast fixes, and added fuels should not be thrown on. Ontario's problems have been compounded by a staggering bureaucracy—Mr McLean will advise you of his thoughts on that—staggering education costs, decrease in federal grants and a multitude of frivolous handouts in social services.

To partially negate the recession you must balance the budget—which I understand now is not going to be so in the next budget coming up—stop providing public funds to destructive associations via the office of francophone affairs; completely revise Ontario's education system and save multimillions of taxpayers' dollars—expert advice can be obtained from Dr Bette Stephenson and Dianne Cunningham—amalgamate all boards into one system; control expenses on a businesslike basis, not on the current unaccountable spending programs we experienced here in Simcoe county as if there was a bottomless pit of money; reassess the school bus system and either revamp it or disband it; completely abandon imposed French classes, French immersion, etc—this one area will save multimillions, case in point, Orillia alone would save \$5 million if we were not having to build an imposed French school for a miniscule portion of our society—

The Chair: Mr Evans, if you would like to sum up, we are at the end of the time.

Mr Evans: Ontario should prepare a point-by-point counterproposal to that raised by Mr Bourassa's Liberal Party, the Allaire committee, the Parti québécois and the Bloc québécois and reassert the fundamental principles of Confederation and a return of the Dominion of Canada, one nation from sea to sea.

Ontario can and will survive and grow within a Canada that contains or does not contain Quebec. We will not become Americans. Our leaders, both provincial and federal, must be fully aware of and sensitive to the deep-seated values of the silent majority, reasonable equality to all and special status to none.

Unfortunately, I did not have time to read two pages regarding aboriginal rights and the Senate.

The Chair: Perhaps you would like to give us or send us a copy of the entire brief

Mr Evans: I will prepare one for Mr McLean.

The Chair: We will move on to a group of people from the Orillia District Collegiate and Vocational Institute: Sheila Healey, Greg Rusnell, Dean Maltby and Sarah Wilton. Are they here? They are scheduled later. We will go on and come back to them.

Mr McLean: Mr Chairman, on a point of order: I had a Joan Lavery in my office to see me. She did not want to make a presentation. However, she prepared one and I would like to ask our clerk to pass it around to all members.

The Chair: That is fine, Mr McLean. The clerk will do that.

1200

CARMEN AGIUS

Ms Agius: I represent a group that is not here yet. I guess we are a little ahead of schedule but I will go ahead because I am prepared.

My name is Carmen Agius and I represent a group of 18 adult students from Twin Lakes Secondary School in Orillia. Our group consists mainly of single moms. We are on low or fixed incomes and we have returned to school in the hopes of bettering our lifestyle.

The rallying point for our address is the GST. As we reviewed its passage into law, we drew the conclusion that the province of Ontario must actively work first for Senate reform and second for a revised constitutional arrangement with the rest of Canada.

Each one of us wants the committee to understand that the goods and services tax is an additional financial burden for low-income families. To us it represents a form of double taxation, an immediate upfront cost, an unknown factor when trying to work out an already tight family budget. Tax credits and cost savings from the previous manufacturers' tax are promises of the future. It is the immediate effect of the tax which has aroused our interest in the future role of Ontario in Confederation.

We understand that Ontario was not a strong supporter of the installation of the GST. We are also aware that members of the Canadian Senate fought long and hard to block the GST. What we do not understand is how Ontario, the other actively opposed provinces and the Senate, all acting together, could not prevent the GST from being passed. What we do see and what this country cannot afford is the image of a Prime Minister who can manipulate his way around both our Senate and our provincial legislators.

If Ontario would commit itself to Senate reform, it is our feeling that we would be providing leadership for the benefit of all Canadian people. For example, if Ontario committed itself to the concept of a triple E Senate then we would be giving the people of Canada a proper check against the almost unilateral power now resting solely in the House of Commons today.

By constitutional law, the Senate still has nearly all the powers of the House of Commons. It can initiate bills. It can amend or reject. It would seem it has all the power to be an effective check system, but the point is the Senate had not voted down a bill since 1939.

Why? Because the senators are appointed by the Prime Minister and will follow the party line rather than fulfilling their duty as the House of sober second thought. Perhaps if senators were elected, they would be better able to deal at arm's length with the Commons and the Prime Minister.

At the first appearance of the GST in the Senate, the chamber standings were 54 Liberals, 34 Conservatives, 4 independents, one independent Liberal and 11 empty seats. Five senators were ready to retire. The GST issue quickly became a power struggle between the Senate leader, Allan MacEachen, and our Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney. Mulroney of course settled the power game by filling the empty seats, appointing an additional eight senators to boot, as was his power under section 26 of the Constitution.

What does Mulroney's action prove to the people of Canada? It simply reinforces the concept that the Senate is a tool of the Commons, nothing more than a rubber stamp for the convenience of Mr Mulroney.

Very recently, the Senate has shown additional signs of performing its proper duties, with reference to the protection of UIC benefits and to its defeat of Bill C-43 regarding abortion.

Our group feels that the Senate is a valuable and worthy tradition and has the potential of becoming a real power check in federal politics. We also feel Ontario should be a leader in restoring the Senate to its proper place in federal power politics.

The Meech Lake accord addressed Senate reform. It did not go far enough. Ontario, in our opinion, should at least insist on an elected Senate with enough powers to make it an effective voice of the regions.

In fact, Meech Lake brings into focus the second issue which our group wishes to address. That is a revised constitutional arrangement with the rest of Canada. Meech was to have a healing effect by bringing Quebec fully under the Constitution, uniting the country of Canada while at the same time giving the provinces more power and identity. Meech Lake did not sail. Perhaps its boat was too full.

Neither did Quebec give up its quest for a distinct society. We agree that Quebec should have its heritage protected by law, but we also believe that Ontario should adopt some state powers.

Ontario should follow the lead of Quebec and institute provincially directed programs funded with federal money. Such programs could include day care initiatives, subsidized housing, more hospital funding, supplementary pensions, adult education, job equity, and family counselling including violence and drug addictions. Ontario politicians, you would be well advised to negotiate more strongly with Ottawa for greater federal subsidy funding.

Perhaps the Allaire committee report was meant to be shocking to English Canada. We did not find it so. We believe that Meech Lake was on the correct path when it allowed power to be shifted towards the provinces, and that Quebec is reflecting the mood of all Canadians when it advocates lesser federalism. Ontario too should be advocating lesser federalism but reinforcing Canadian unity.

We love this country of ours. We liken it to our own families. Within the family of Canada we have got to realize that the provincial children are quickly growing up. Like children, they each have their own distinct personalities. Just think of this: Ontario the stockbroker; Quebec the lawyer; British Columbia the young businesswoman; Alberta the mining engineer; Saskatchewan and Manitoba the farmers; and the Maritimes the fishermen.

Quebec, as the lawyer, has always talked the most and therefore has been given the most consideration. We are proud of BC, of Alberta, with its handsome wild streak, the others are steady and true, but Ontario can always be depended upon to come up with the ready cash.

As Canadian parents, we have the right to be proud. As we watch our family maturing, we must realize each of us has earned more responsibilities. As wise parents, we

should grant those freedoms, knowing that the family will stand strong. As every mother knows, if we were to lose one we would be devastated.

I would like to thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for allowing us to express our opinions today. I am sorry that the rest of the group could not be here because I think you might have had some questions for them.

The Chair: Thank you for your presentation. If you would like to wait, we will be able to have at least one question.

Mr Offer: In our travels that type of theme has recurred. I think it is somewhat founded on the fact that people seem to feel separate or distanced from the central government in terms of their needs and their requirements.

The issues you brought forward dealing with Senate reform and a new Constitutional rearrangement all seem to be interrelated in that they are founded on a need—basically it might be regional or it might right now be within the purview of the federal government—but there is a sense that there just is no way to get closer to the federal government to have that need realized.

I am wondering if you can share with us your thoughts, as we go through this process, whether when we hear the activities being taken on in the province of Quebec in terms of the requirement or asking for more powers, the role of Ontario should be to look upon the activities of Quebec and to see if there is anything that we should be negotiating with the federal government. Whether we should as a province be looking at acquiring further powers and responsibilities so that those, such as groups you represent, will be able to have a closer contact in order to realize those needs.

1210

Ms Agius: I think that is basically what I said. If you take the family analogy a little further, there comes a time when the teenagers want to strike out on their own, and they need to; they cannot always be relying on mom and dad, the federal government, to take care of them.

I believe that in our Constitution there are provisions that if we do not want to participate in federally funded programs, as long as Ontario provides similar programs for the citizens of Ontario we are still entitled to that federal funding. Because Ontario is probably the richest province right now, a lot of the money is going from Ontario to Quebec.

I do not have any problems with that. I think Quebec is smart. They had it figured out. They know what they need and they just keep asking for it. They demand it, they threaten, they whine, they have a temper tantrum if need be. They get what they need for the citizens of Quebec. I think it is time for us to start thinking about the citizens of Ontario, what they really need, and let us put some of that federal money back into Ontario because we certainly need it here.

SHEILA SLUSAREK

The Chair: We have one addition to the list, somebody who apparently had been told that she would be heard but I guess does not appear on our list, Sheila Slusarek.

Mrs Slusarek: What are the values we share as Canadians? Not so many years ago I would have read that question and simply replied, "We Canadians value our beautiful country, its freedoms and equal opportunity for all people regardless of race, colour or religion." Today I could not and would not make that same statement.

Our government, through a program called the equity program, has done the exact opposite to the aforementioned value. People are hired based on their ethnic background under a government-regulated quota system. Another alarming fact of the equity program is its representation covers every possible group in Canada. Everyone is identified with one shocking omission: the white English-speaking male. He is conspicuously absent. On questioning this exclusion, I was informed the government's response was, "The white English-speaking male has had enough representation in the past and this is catch-up time." Please tell me this is an error.

I understand what the government thinks it is doing, but no matter how I try to absorb this philosophy I see it as discriminatory. Hiring people to fill an ethnic quota is an offence not only to the person who got hired, but to all other Canadians who do not qualify due to race or language.

During the Second World War my mother's brother, Donald Gordon, was killed and buried in France. He was 19 years old. My mother hopes to visit his grave some day before she dies. I cannot help but wonder what he would think if he were with us today. His parents were English and French. He was a Canadian, nothing more and nothing less. Now in this country that he so proudly fought for, he would have no voice, no representation at all. You see, Donald Gordon could not speak French and he did not come from anywhere else. He died a white English-speaking male and today he would not even be considered for the government's equity program.

Another disturbing thought enters my head when you ask me about my values. I value people in this country as Canadians. I hate this francophone-anglophone nonsense. I know what a francophone is. A francophone is a mother tongue French-speaking person. He is also supposed to be the other founding nation, along with the ever-elusive anglophone.

Who and what are anglophones? I am guessing when I say an anglophone must be British. I only think that because of the government's insistence on the two founding nations theory: the French and the British. Anyway, my point here is, how come there is an Office for Francophone Affairs but not one for anglophones, or Britiphones actually. If they are supposed to be equal, where is the British representation? The bottom line, of course, to all of this is, where do I and several other English-speaking Canadians fit in? We are not francophone, British, allophone or aboriginal.

How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples? You can begin by dropping the two founding nations story. How can a country be founded when it was already inhabited? If you insist on having the British and French being top dogs over here, then call it that. The two fighting invaders might be more realistic. If we get into invaders' rights, I do believe the English defeated the French. Therefore, with all due respect to our forefathers

allowing the French to keep their language and culture, however noble at the time and correct, and it truly was, now the French not only want to keep their language and culture in Quebec, they are demanding it be promoted and protected all across the country. Anything less and we are accused of being anti-French.

Give the original people of this beautiful country all their land claims back. Give them their rights to govern themselves in their own language and culture. I believe the aboriginal people of this country still love Canada and Canadians. They will work with us, maybe even teach us a few things. God knows, they have been patient.

I do believe in a strong federal government. I think we need the federal government to do basically what it does now with one very strong exception: no more favouritism or talk of special status for anyone. I would like Canada to stay together. I do not reject Quebec, its culture or its people. I just do not believe it should be favoured.

The federal government special grant for babies born in Quebec to preserve their culture is elitist. All babies born in Canada are equally important. This is aggravating and insulting to all Canadians, and I think the intolerance by the rest of Canada is beginning to show.

Quebec keeps threatening to separate and blaming all the rest of Canada for not wanting it. The federal government should step in and support the rest of Canada in demanding that this kind of rhetoric be stopped and not encouraging it.

Provincially, I think each province should be able to be more reflective of its people. In several provinces there are more Italians, Polish, etc. I believe providing services to suit the needs of the province is far more acceptable and understandable than mandatorily providing and enforcing French.

I believe in referenda. Quebec has them and they represent what the people in that province want. The rest of us should have the same opportunity.

One last point that I would like to leave with you is my particular sense of loss when the Lord's Prayer was removed from our schools in Ontario, because two new Canadians found it offensive. As I said before, do not crumble when attacked by a minority. Stand up for us and our heritage. God cannot possibly be non-offensive in the separate school system and offensive in the public. Do not take away the rights of the majority and a way of Canadian lifestyle because of a pressure group. Give us a chance to speak before you take anything else we value.

1220

Ms Churley: I have a question for you. Your comment about, I guess it is about, majority rule and that your public officials should listen to majority rule, I wonder what you think would happen to minorities. I believe that governments are elected to protect minorities as well, because if governments do not, who the hell else is going to do it for minorities, particularly if we are in a system where we govern by referendum and whichever race has a majority would rule the day? I fear that if governments are not there to also protect minorities, we will go back to the

Dark Ages where as you know, minorities, including women, suffered all kinds of atrocities.

My question is around that as well. You are a woman; I am a woman. There are still very few, women in politics and in other areas; in fact it has been partly affirmative action that has allowed us to get where we are. How are we going to do it? We know that women once were not allowed to be doctors. They were literally not allowed to vote. There were all kinds of things that we were shut out of, just because we were women. How do we protect our rights if we do not have governments which are willing to listen to minorities?

Mrs Slusarek: I understand your question, but I think more highly of the Canadian people. I believe women may at one time and possibly still are not offered as much of an equal opportunity, but I have three daughters and I have taught all three of them that, "This is your world too, and there really isn't going to be a lot of problem if you work hard and study." There is nothing blocking women now, I do not believe. Maybe in my generation if you could type that was satisfactory, but not any longer. We do not see women that way any more, and I really do not believe most men see women that way any more.

I do not think we need to go on with what it was, because I do not think it is like that any more. I think we have equality and I think most Canadians are not racist. I think most Canadians are very tolerant. I think most Canadians are very proud to be Canadians. I think minority groups would be protected by the majority of Canadians. I know, personally, if I thought a minority group was being mistreated, I and many fellow Canadians would stand up on its behalf.

But I think when you sacrifice the wishes of the majority, for example, when the Lord's Prayer was removed because of a minority, you have chaos. It is like in a family structure. There are two parents and maybe three children, and if you say everybody has equal rights in that home—you have to have some sort of consensus as to what the rules are and there has to be a leadership. Therefore, I say the federal government, which oversees, and the children all have to be treated equally and fairly. You cannot worry about the past or the way it used to be; you can only deal with the present.

An answer to your question is I do not feel minorities in this country are going to be badly treated. The only minority that I feel is very badly treated right now in this country is the minority of English-speaking Quebecers who are not allowed to put up English-speaking signs. They have been there for as long as the French, and I do not see why no one in Canada is helping that minority. I really do not understand that. But I also believe, "Well, you are in Quebec, so learn French." It is much easier to learn it if you are among it. So I really do not feel that badly, but I do think it is wrong, because there are so many in Montreal.

Ms Churley: So you do think then that governments should protect minority rights, as in Quebec for instance.

Mrs Slusarek: But they are not. In Quebec they are not.

Ms Churley: But I am asking you that question. For instance, in Quebec you feel that it is the government's responsibility to protect English-minority rights.

Mrs Slusarek: But not at the expense of the majority. Yes, I think minorities must be protected. Yes, I do. But I also think it must never be at the expense of the majority. If the majority of people are saying, "It's wrong to remove the Lord's Prayer," then why could two people overrule it? Because they are a minority. If they find God is offensive, then that is their right. I am not going to put them in prison.

Ms Churley: Okay, I understand what you are saying. Thank you.

ORILLIA DISTRICT COLLEGIATE AND VOCATIONAL INSTITUTE

The Chair: I will call our final group of presenters from the Orillia District Collegiate and Vocational Institute, Greg Rusnell and Dean Maltby. Just for our records, if you could identify yourselves, we would appreciate that.

Mr Maltby: Chairperson and honourable members, my name is Dean Maltby, I am 18 years old and for the past five years I have attended ODCVI, where I am president in my last year. I was born and raised in Orillia, but was fortunate enough to have my fling in the Big Smoke as a legislative page in 1985. I plan on going back to Toronto to finish my education but now, as a citizen and youth of Canada, I have a few concerns about our future.

I believe the goal of this country should be a progressive goal that builds on a unified country. That means 10 provinces and two territories. However, this cannot be achieved with sporadic debates or meetings. Canada is ever-changing and fluctuating. Our Constitution should change to fit the needs of the country. This requires regular interprovincial meetings to accommodate these changes.

Second, as the second-largest country in the world with an abundance of natural resources, we should be utilizing them to their maximum potential. Natural resources are our biggest asset, next to our younger generation. If Canada is to become a major power in the world, we must get rid of free trade and begin to handle our own resources. Our export dollars must exceed our import dollars. In order to be able to handle these resources, Canada's technology must also be developed and this takes money. We must go into debt before we can get out of debt.

With these resources and technology, one last ingredient is needed and that is people. We must keep the youth of Canada in Canada. Invest in our abilities as future leaders, because we are the future. We realize it will take money, people, technology and resources to achieve one common goal for a unified Canada. This goal is a wealthier Canada with a higher standard of living that cares for the sick and the old and develops our youth to perpetuate this goal with generosity to share with the rest of the world. Invest in our youth.

The Chair: Thank you very much. Are there any comments that you want to add?

Mr Rusnell: Yes, my name is Greg Rusnell. We are here today to discuss Canada's future. There are many problems to be addressed.

First and foremost, I believe, is Quebec's role in Canada. I personally would like to see Quebec separate. I believe that the government of Quebec is demanding more than it deserves from the government of Canada. It should be no more than one province in Canada, not the province of Canada. I am afraid, however, that if Quebec were to separate, Mr Mulroney would squander many of this country's resources in aid to Quebec as a new nation. I feel that if it is to separate, it should be treated as a foreign nation. It should be given no aid, financial or otherwise, and it should attempt to construct its own foreign policy.

My next concern deals with the political representation of this government. I do not believe that the federal government represents the people or their interests any longer. I believe, and this belief saddens me, that the democratic process has become only symbolic in this country. The major political parties provide leaders who promise to gain the most for the party. I recall watching the Liberal leadership race on the occasion of Mr Trudeau's retirement. John Turner was elected to lead that party solely because he promised to advance the party. What kind of political system do we have when voters are thinking not, "Whom do I like the most?" but "Which one do I dislike the least?" I believe that for this reason our system is in a shambles and needs some kind of help.

Another thing that worries me is the backwardness of government funding. It is almost comically easy to defraud such services as the unemployment benefit, yet it is almost impossible for students to receive adequate funding for school. I am familiar with several cases where someone has been receiving unemployment insurance and has been working under the table, so to speak. The people responsible for sanding and clearing our city streets are just one example. Whoever is in charge of that service pays the employees in cash and keeps little or no records of their payments so that these people can defraud the government of money that could be better spent elsewhere, perhaps in funding for students attending college or university.

I do not understand the OSAP process at all. First applications for funding are refused and second ones are examined. Why? It is not like the government is giving the money away. All loans are to be repaid. Unemployment insurance is not repaid. Perhaps spending should be shifted from those who are not working to those who are attempting to continue their education.

1230

My final concern relates to the recycling in this country. I do not know if this is a municipal, a provincial or a federal concern, but I believe it should be dealt with by all three. I have an unstructured suggestion, but one that, with some development, I believe could work. Why not adopt the pay-for-disposal plan in effect in Peterborough and transfer it to a nationwide plan? Take the money from this and, along with some federal and provincial funding, build between one and five sorting plants in each province, depending on the population of each province. It would be the responsibility of these plants to sort the garbage. The

reusable material could be sold to the proper industries and the remaining, hopefully minor, material, could be shipped to landfill sites until a more suitable, environmentally friendly plan can be found. Just as a subsuggestion, people who are receiving unemployment benefits could be the workforce in these factories. That would probably reduce the number of claims for that benefit.

In closing, I would just like to say, on a very informal note, what this committee represents is very important. You are people who can do something with the suggestions we have. I just hope that you actually consider these suggestions. I do not want to believe that this committee is just a token of the Ontario government to make people of this province think we are being listened to. Thank you very much for your time and thank you for listening.

Mr McLean: I want to congratulate both of you for your briefs presented here today. It is nice to see the younger generation taking part in it. But I also want the record to show, when Dean sends the Hansard to his grandfather whom I sat with in the Ontario Legislature, that he was a representative from Guelph, Harry Worton. Harry sat for some 20 years in the Ontario Legislature, and I know that Dean will be sending the record to his grandfather. I just wanted his name to be in there.

Mr T. Martin: I too am very happy to see you young people participate in this exercise of discussion about our future as a country and Ontario's role in Confederation, because really we, as the leaders today, establish a foundation upon which you will build and reach out into the world. I guess I just challenge you to think about a couple of things—and maybe offer some comment—that concern me as we in Canada struggle with what we really value and what role we will play in the world today.

I look at that from two perspectives. One, I think we as Canadians see ourselves as peacekeepers, as a country that can not only go out there and facilitate peace, but also show to the world a country that is able to make peace within its own boundaries.

The other question is, as we launch into the global economy and we want to participate with other countries in economic endeavours, does it not behoove us on both of those counts to be a country that is very tolerant and supportive of the various cultures and linguistic groups that live in our country, so that we might set an example? Not only that, but our understanding of the peoples who live within our boundaries re their way of thinking and what they value and how they communicate with each other might help us to be a leader in the global economy in so many ways economically as we move into the future and as we develop a country that will be a foundation for you to build on, for you and your children.

Mr Maltby: I am not really sure I understand the entire question.

Mr T. Martin: I guess I just wanted to challenge you and to ask you if you have given that any thought and if that would have any impact on how you might think in front of the question of how we live as different people in this country.

Mr Maltby: If we are talking about the free trade issue here, where you believe that if we share our resources and everything, we will become more of a world leader, is that what your—sorry, I do not quite understand.

Mr T. Martin: Okay, yes, if I might just maybe—

The Chair: Perhaps if you could rephrase the question, Mr Martin, it would be easier for the deputants to answer.

Mr T. Martin: Okay. I think that we, as Canadians, want to be leaders on the world stage both as peacekeepers and in an economic sense. Does it not behoove us as a people within our own boundaries to be understanding of the various cultures and linguistic groups and ways of thinking that are out there in the world and that we have within our own boundaries, to be able to set up structures that enhance that and therefore put us in a better place, give us an edge actually, as we go out into the larger world community to operate? I think those are some of the basic questions we are asking as we look at ourselves under Confederation.

Mr Maltby: Yes. I think the diverse cultures in Canada are an asset to our country and we should use them to perpetuate the goal that we would like to become a world leader in the future.

Mr T. Martin: I just challenge you to think about that a little bit too, and perhaps if there is something else that comes forward, you might want to share it with us, particularly you as young people. It is your country that we are building.

Mr Rusnell: I believe that if we are to have an understanding between all the cultures that we have in Canada, the understanding should work both ways. It should not just be one group that is understanding of the needs and the culture of all the other ones. If we are to present any kind of a united face or front to the rest of the world where we become a country that is admirable, we should be trying to perpetuate the idea of multiculturalism where everybody has the right and one group is not recognized as above and beyond.

Mr Bisson: Part of the thing is, and I think it was raised in some of the deliberations that we have had up to now, how much of that is based on truth and how much of it is perception. But that is not what I want to get on to.

One of the things that you talked about inside your presentation was that we need to better direct our funds to where we can utilize them better, and you used OSAP as an example. I agree with you. I think, as most people in this Legislature do, that we wish that we did have a pot full of money that we can reach into to fund education the way that it needs. We recognize that.

But I have a bit of a problem in that what happens in this country, and what we are going through right now, is that we are looking for some short-term solutions and quick fixes to fix our problem. We are going to say, "Well, we can fix the problem by not providing any bilingualism services, so we'll generate billions of dollars and we'll be able to do everything." Or we say, "We're going to do this thing or that thing or the other," and what we end up doing is really not addressing the problem.

What I want to ask you is that, first of all, you said that we would need to direct money from the UI funds into education. I agree with what your premise is, but the problem I have with it is this: The unemployed worker did not ask to be unemployed. He has rights; she has rights. The injured worker who got injured in the mine or the factory or wherever did not ask to be injured. He or she has rights. Where do we balance these rights off?

Do we say we are going to give to just a group of people within our society because we do not want to recognize that there are other things out there? Because if that is what you are purporting, I am really at a loss because I was always thinking that in this country we are developing a much more caring society and I want you to share with us and try to tell us how we get to that. How do we get people to work together, recognizing that there is diversity in this country on many issues, not just on language, but on philosophies, on needs, on what is happening within society? How do we balance that off?

What we are hearing is that there is frustration out there, and we understand it and are trying to come to grips with how we can go on from here. But how can you say that we are going to protect somebody's rights by taking—well, I will get back to what I was saying. In regard to the UI thing, you said that we have to take funds out of there to put them into another one. How do you balance that off when those people have rights as well?

Mr Rusnell: I admit that it is too sweeping to say that we should take money from UI and put it in OSAP. My concern stems more from the fact that the people who are able to work and are actually working but just are not claiming are the ones who are defrauding UI.

Mr Bisson: But it is a very sweeping statement that you are making. The illusion is that people—

The Chair: Sorry, we cannot just keep going back and forth. You have made a point, you have asked a question, let's just let the people answer the question.

Mr Rusnell: The problem of deciding where the fine line is is not an easy decision. It would almost have to come down to individual cases, which it seems to me it does now anyway. I have had some experience with unemployment benefits. I have friends and family members who have experienced that, and in some cases it is a very good service. It is very admirable what this country does, providing money for people who cannot work so that they can support themselves. But at the same time, there are people who can support themselves, can work, are working and

just are not saying that they are working, and that is the concern that I have—

Mr Bisson: So do we penalize the group? That is the problem.

Mr Rusnell: —that it seems so easy to defraud that system. I would suggest harder restrictions on receiving the benefit and perhaps a tighter watch on the people who are receiving unemployment. People who are injured obviously cannot work, but there are people who are healthy and have no physical or mental disabilities, who can work and just do not seem to. People who go 36 or 42 weeks, or whatever it is that UI provides, and then suddenly magically have a job again. That is the concern I have with UI.

Mr Bisson: The problem is right now there is no job. That is the problem.

Mr Maltby: May I make a point on that? Concerning unemployment insurance, it seems that the highest total money that you can collect is higher than the average income of this city. Maybe we can take some of that money and invest it in creating jobs or creating something that these people can do instead of just collecting insurance for not working.

The Chair: Are there any other questions? All right. Thanks very much.

We did have other people who had indicated that they would like to be heard. Unfortunately, because of the time constraints this morning and having to vacate the room in two or three minutes, we are not able to do that, as we normally would have extended the time to do that. We apologize. We invite those of you who did not get a chance to speak to us to send us your written comments if you so wish. Please do not worry about how polished a document it is. We will accept and appreciate any comments that come, in whatever form they may be.

I want to thank you once again for being here. I thank those people who made presentations. It is clear that we received a number of additional perspectives this morning that perhaps we had not to this point heard in quite the same vein. That too is part of the process for us as a committee, to go through and sort that out, and I thank you for that.

We will continue our hearings this afternoon in Colingwood as we proceed across the province, and invite you to follow our proceedings through the parliamentary channel if you are interested. We are adjourned until this afternoon.

The committee recessed at 1243.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1604 at the Cranberry Inn, Collingwood.

The Chair: I would like to call this meeting of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation to order. I want to say to those people who are here in the audience that we are pleased to be here in Collingwood this afternoon and this evening at the Cranberry Inn. This is the 8th day of our trips across the province in various locations and I guess the 10th community we have been in. We were earlier today in Orillia, and we will be continuing over the next two weeks in various other locations in the southwest and in the eastern part of the province. We have been already to the northern and the north-central part of the province. It is a process of allowing people from different parts of the province to talk to us and with us about their feelings and aspirations about the future of our province and our country at this important time in our Confederation.

I want to introduce the members of the committee who are here. This is an all-party select committee made up of representatives from the three political parties that have representatives at Queen's Park. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Steven Mahoney and Steven Offer; from the Conservative Party we have Allan McLean and Charles Harnick; and from the NDP caucus, in addition to myself, Tony Silipo, Chair of the committee, we have Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, David Winninger, Tony Martin and Dan Waters.

As it happens from time to time in our hearings, we have, in addition to the printed list that may be circulating, a number of other people who have indicated they would be interested in talking to us. What we will try to do, in an attempt to accommodate those people as well, is ask those people who are speaking to please try to limit your comments to about 10 minutes if you are presenting as an individual and about 20 minutes if you are presenting as a group. In that way we will have, hopefully, a little time we can then use to add those people to the list at the end of that session.

RONALD EMO

The Chair: I ask Ronald Emo to come up and begin this afternoon.

Mr Emo: I guess I am really not sure why I am here. Our young provincial member suggested I do a presentation, and I think it was probably a good idea. I have put together a few random thoughts as to what I think are some of the problems facing Canada and perhaps some solutions. I doubt if anything you will hear from me is particularly new or innovative, as that certainly would not be Canadian, eh? Anyway, here goes.

Like many other Canadians, I was disappointed that the Meech Lake accord collapsed. As with most negotiated deals, it was not perfect, but rightly or wrongly it had been agreed to by all premiers and at least it offered a foundation for improvement over the years. But that was then and this is now.

In my opinion we, as Canadians, have to put aside our usual selfish and regional interests. We need Quebec in our Confederation and Quebec needs the rest of Canada. The sum of the parts is much less than the whole. If Quebec were to leave, whatever that really means, we will either quickly degenerate into a Northern Ireland scenario if we decide to try to stop them or else we will be even more rapidly assimilated by the United States which, given the Americanization of our culture and legal system via the charter as well as the emerging North American trading bloc, may in fact be inevitable, and perhaps under some conditions even desirable. But I do not think that is the issue today.

I do believe that if we are going to reinvent Canada it must be done as efficiently as possible. We need to set out clear responsibilities and duties for each level of government. Do we really need three and a half levels of government to look after us? Because they always seem to be overlapping jurisdictions, so that one level can have a ready-made scapegoat and blame the other for not providing funds, leadership or whatever.

Why not, through some sort of constitutional conference, decide what the federal government should look after? Obviously defence, foreign affairs, currency, the environment come to mind. What should the province do? And what should the local municipalities do?

Clearly, in my opinion, as a former councillor and mayor, the closer the responsibility and service is to the electorate, who are, after all, paying the bills, the better will be the democratic results. People can and should have a greater responsibility in deciding their future. If one community wants to spend its taxes on an art gallery while another values health care, so be it. Let's give each level of government clearly defined responsibilities in areas of taxation. Why not try the interesting democratic concepts of fixed and maximum terms of office, recall, referenda and local initiative? It sounds American, but it is probably more like the Greek city-states in which our democracy had its origins. There may well be problems, but as the presence of so many of you as newly elected provincial members of Parliament clearly demonstrates, people are looking for new and more accountable government, simpler government and above all more efficient government.

I think we need to be open to innovative change and not be protective of existing power structures. I personally have no problem with Quebec and the other provinces gaining greater powers and in turn relinquishing some of those responsibilities that are better administered to the local level to be administered by meaningful-sized municipalities. Perhaps if the local municipalities are large enough we would not need county or regional governments. Some provinces may have to band together to be able to efficiently provide some of these delegated services, but that is all right, in my opinion. The territories should become separate provinces or be added on to adjacent provinces. Our native people should, like the rest of

us, do their best to be Canadian—not Inuit, Mohawks or whatever.

1610

And that leads to my next sacred cow: multiculturalism. Why, in a nation of 25 million people spread across 3,000 miles, do we have so many of our people who not only respect and venerate their origins—and that is all right—but seek and obtain government funding to keep their ancestral cultures and languages alive? In my opinion, we have little chance of surviving as a nation if we are really a series of tribes, whether they be Ojibwa, Dene, Irish or Vietnamese. We need to be Canadians, not Sikhs, Italians or Ukrainians. We need to remember that a Canadian can be either French-speaking or English-speaking, because that is the way it is. Other languages are interesting, advantageous and helpful, but not necessary. We should encourage our young people to learn both of our official languages, but we gain nothing and lose much if we dictate that all of us have to be bilingual.

To sum up these disjointed ramblings, may I end by saying we have a good country. I think most of us would rather live in an improved and more efficient Canada than join the United States, but we need to give all our provinces and our local municipalities much more clearly defined responsibility, with the bottom line being that power goes to the lowest level of government that can do the job.

Mr Chairman, I thank you for hearing my views. One of my volunteer jobs is vice-chair of the Ontario Winter Games, which will be in Collingwood three weeks from today. Perhaps, if you like, we could add Constitution ducking to that. It might be a blood sport; I am not sure.

Mr Beer: That would be an interesting addition to the games, I am sure.

One of the things that has been interesting to all of us as we have gone through these first couple of weeks—I am not sure if I would say it has been so much of a surprise, but it has been consistent, where people have really said, "Look, we think you're going to have to see more powers at the provincial and the local level." You note that you have been mayor and councillor. My sense is that if we had been doing this 20 or 25 years ago, that would perhaps not have been a direction we would hear. I wonder if you could share with us a little more why your sense is that we have to do it, as we clarify various responsibilities and powers, more in terms of what the province and the regional, however you want to define it in terms of local government—is this something you yourself would say you have changed as time has gone on? Because it is a consistent theme that is running through a lot of what we are hearing.

Mr Emo: I am not sure where you are coming from, but I would say that over the last 20 or 30 years the local municipalities have been called upon to do more and more things. We have gotten involved with the environment and housing and a great amount of social services, things like that, that a generation ago really were not too much. Council of the day, as long as you kept the roads plowed and the weeds cut and the dogs from running loose too much, that really was about the extent. But as you know, the local

municipality is called upon to do more and more things and to pay a greater amount of the costs. In local government, every decision you make on Monday night you have to defend in the coffee shop on Tuesday, and sometimes local municipal councillors get a bit upset when they are carrying the tax burden for things they have had really no input into. The BNA Act says the municipalities are creatures of the province. They should not be their handmaidens. It should be more of a partnership.

Ms Churley: In our travels to date we have heard a lot from aboriginal people. Something you mention in your brief is that we should all become Canadians. Of course, we could get into a long discussion of what that means, to be a Canadian, and we do not have time for it now. But what I would like to ask you is how you suggest we deal with this. The aboriginal people are, I believe, a perfect example of what happens when we try to assimilate people, try to turn them into our European definition of Canadian. Look what happened. We took away their values, their culture, their language, all sorts of things, and look what happened to them as a people and look at the mess we are in now as a result of doing that; all the things we are just starting to realize we could have learned from them—the environment you just mentioned is a good example—but we thought we knew better and did it our way.

Do you not think that is a very good example of why we need to accept, of all people, the aboriginal people, but also other cultures, that it makes us richer and we learn from each other, that it is bad, it is wrong and gets us into a lot of trouble to try to turn people into this melting pot?

Mr Emo: Did we do that to the native people or did they accept our culture and our way of life without having proper training, perhaps, in it? But I believe very much we should have the melting pot and out of that, at the end, will come a Canadian.

Ms Churley: But it did not work. That is what I am saying.

Mr Emo: It will. My parents came from Northern Ireland, and many of the people here, I am sure, are first-generation Canadians, whatever that means, and we have somehow assimilated. I am not an Irish Canadian; I regard myself as Canadian. Granted, I am a traditional WASP, I guess, but I just think that if we do not somehow bring ourselves together these divisions will go on and on, where we have little reserves all over the countryside. We will have a special native province—maybe that is a solution—with little municipal jurisdictions wherever there are reserves. I do not know.

Mr Harnick: We have had differing views presented to us about the kind of central or federal government we should have. Some people have said we have to reduce the powers of the federal government and put more power in the hands of the provincial governments. Other people have said there is a danger in doing that, the danger being that without a strong central government, we have no government setting basic minimum standards in areas such as health care or education or social services, and because of that provinces that are wealthier than their neighbours may have better levels of health care or education because they

can afford it. What is your view of the need to have a federal government that sets national standards?

Mr Emo: I think in some situations, those that are clearly national, really, I should say, almost international, I think that is where the federal government should be. But in many ways we in Canada have government we cannot afford. It sounds right-wing business person, which I guess I am, but we cannot be all things to all people. We cannot keep on going towards some great nirvana. Health care is a choice case. I am chairman of our hospital board and we are squeezing budgets all the time, and it is going to be even tighter, I am sure, as the year comes up. We have to make do more with less. I guess, if you keep things closer to the level that is paying, the level of government, then maybe you are going to get more efficiencies; and, as I said in my brief, if some area decides it wants an art gallery rather than a hospital—I think that is pretty farfetched, but if that were the case, then I suspect those are the people who have to live with it.

You hear in the United States where a school district has run out of money and all of a sudden the schools are closed for a while. I do not think that is a great idea, but on the other hand that does get the message across, that the people paying said, "Hey, we don't have any money for this."

Just to pick up on that, we are faced with a situation in which Quebec is saying very strongly that it wants more powers and I guess we have to have a good look at that, because I think we need Quebec in our Confederation or otherwise we will have a far worse scenario than you are suggesting there.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

DON ALEXANDER

The Chair: I call next Don Alexander.

Mr Alexander: I live in Owen Sound, about 40 kilometres along Georgian Bay from here. Very often when we begin to look at our future we are criticized for seeing it only in economic terms. I would like to plant a few ideas that begin by looking at it from the role of the artist, the performing artist, the visual artist. Perhaps a new approach to the problems that confront us is that it has always been worth while to look to the artist for new guidelines to where we were going, some hints about our future.

Glenn Gould produced a radio documentary about 20 years ago called *The Idea of North*, and I would like to pick up on that theme. He was interested at that time in the very creative juices that the north provided for him. Initially, it was simply up north at the cottage in Muskoka or Haliburton, but later it came to mean the more arctic parts of our country.

1620

I think that seeing something special in the idea of north is a way of uncovering many of the things that have pulled us together in this northern part of North America. We can use the idea of north to expand our understanding of a shared future as well, so looking at the past and the future. And if our ideas of north were given more promi-

nence, we could unearth a wealth of economic and cultural opportunities not only among the parts of Canada but also internationally.

I am not talking about a north that is somewhere else, where you were the first part of this week. I am talking about Canada as a northern political entity, Ontario as a northern political entity, as a northern place; Quebec, indeed, all of Canada. These are northern places. No matter what kind of realignment politically happens in this northern part of North America in the future, we will continue to share that common heritage of north.

I am suggesting that Ontario should undertake a pan-northern awareness and development of those ties. They would embrace Quebec and other Canadian provinces and territories and then go international with Greenland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland and the northern republics of the Soviet Union, as they too are beginning to decide new ways of where the power will lie. We will not call it separation there.

A pan-northern component then in provincial policy, in cultural and economic fields, I think, will reveal some shared interests that we have to the particular point at issue here with Quebec and will also counterbalance some of the dominating influences that come from the United States. As we see Mexican free trade talks on the horizon, we may have more interest in creating this pan-northern identity to counterbalance that.

Looking at the artists again, I have been interested in this idea of north for about 20 years. Robertson Davies has spoken of a peculiar Canadian individuality and he pointed out that our spirit is far more comparable to the Scandinavians and to the Russians than to the United States or to Great Britain.

The northern psyche: You may remember at the Art Gallery of Ontario in Toronto a show of paintings that showed that there was a landscape school evolving in Scandinavia in the first part of this century very similar to our Group of Seven and to our Canadian landscape painting. That psyche of north is very strong and I think political boundaries are well-knit when they are knit around a feeling of commonality.

While not an artist, but in the art of politics, I would mention that Stephen Lewis, when he was ambassador to the United Nations, mentioned that the ambassador to the UN from Norway came to be his closest friend. He said jokingly at a conference in Toronto that at first he thought this was an accident, but he came to believe that it was "geographically genetic." There may be something there.

The idea of north has several determinants, I think, that are common to all of us. North, I think, means great weather variables, from heat wave to snowstorm and cold weather. That is the first determinant.

The second one would be that north means that in some parts of that country there are relatively low population densities, and for significant numbers of people there is the problem of isolation and great distance, and that is a political problem. I think all parts of Canada, certainly Ontario and Quebec, have that problem politically.

The third determinant would mean that there is a shared experience of those great varieties of the length of

day: the winter solstice, the short days, and then in the summer the enchantment, if you will, of those long evenings and those long days. In Leningrad, they celebrate the solstice. Perhaps the Legislature could think of another holiday. We could have Quebec do it too and we could have a summer solstice holiday. The tourist industry, which is important in this area, would appreciate that we get a jump-start on summer and maybe lengthen that. We are always talking of shoulder seasons.

The people who are shaped by those three determinants I think have a lot in common, and I think that we hide those commonalities very often as we look to the United States for direction, or to more southern places. Some of the examples: I think that the native nations in the northern part of North America have some shared experiences and tribal structures that have helped them come together in the Assembly of First Nations right across this northern part of North America. I was in Milwaukee at a powwow and was really surprised at the difference of the tribes and the native peoples in the US Midwest, in the more southern climates, in their dwellings and in their tribal structure.

Our severe weather and our isolation of winter, with our heritage of settlement created a tradition of mutual support and co-operation that is evidenced in our support systems that we are more partial to than our neighbours to the south. And I think if we look in the Scandinavian countries, they too have felt this common care for other people and I think that can go back to situations where because of isolation in winter, and I speak of Norwegian valleys that were isolated for three or four months, you had to get along together and share in problem-solving.

Newcomers, even, to this part of North America, I think they share the experience of having learned to wear long underwear or cope with winter and also the shared experience. You will know this from people who have immigrated here from a small country like the Netherlands, the idea that a friend can live 500 and 600 kilometres away, that it is a day's trip, not just a short trip to see a friend. That is just one of the adjustments they have made and I think we all share that in Canada.

Inuit groups, by the way, from Canada, the USSR, from Alaska and from Greenland have for several years now been getting together biannually and they are creating some kind of pan-northern organization. So I believe there are many trade opportunities—to get away from the artists—business opportunities that are made visible if we think of this idea of north.

Ontario and Quebec and other northern governments would share an interest, for example, in the architecture of northern cities. There have been conferences on those, but one conference is not enough. That is an ongoing thing and the housing policies that Ontario will be developing, I think, can be particularly geared to the idea of north.

We have some special needs. In Owen Sound there is a not-for-profit housing development to be built this year. It is being sponsored by the legion. The tendency is for older people, but it has a centre hall plan. It is a single floor, so there are no elevators, but this wide hall allows a person, if he or she cannot cope with those slippery streets, to walk a good city block and walk around and visit. I know people

who use these large, brightly lit centre halls in this architecture to overcome the isolation of winter.

We share an interest in resource management. Certainly timber resource management is something we have in front of us and the Scandinavians are reported in the media to be doing things differently, sometimes with success, sometimes not, but I think that shared interest could be developed.

1630

The weather and daylight variables in northern places indicate some special considerations for energy and environment, and I think this is very important to us, that we look to this pan-northern community, because our problems of energy, whether heating our houses or the great distances, are going to continue to be very great and may create an additional cost on production, however you measure it. The degradation of things that get into the environment is speeded up in a hotter climate. In a colder climate, those bad things hang around for ever. So we have a common interest with these other northern countries in environmental issues, and if we have an industrial strategy, let us say, that intends to make use of environmental technologies, we have a lot to share in a pan-northern community.

The links that we could look for: I think social democratic governments exist in the Scandinavian countries. There is an international or something that gets together, and I think perhaps a link could be initiated at those meetings with the Scandinavian governments.

Our doorway to the European community: While Quebec I think can have a doorway through its relations with France, I think that Norway and Sweden are likely to join the European community soon, and I think maybe Norway and Sweden would find that despite their membership in the European community, their interests in north are not of interest to the rest of that community. So we may have a relationship there.

So in business, social arrangements and government institutions, we have a lot in common with other areas of Canada because of our idea of north. I think we often hide our northern realities. We get sucked into agendas of more southerly countries, and if as a province Ontario promotes a pan-northern affinity, I think it will expose many of the shared realities between Ontario, Quebec and other regions of Canada and, at the same time, it would provide us with some international opportunities, both culturally and in business.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Alexander, for that fascinating and different approach to some of the issues we are grappling with. I know that your presentation has sparked a lot of interest. We will not be able to go through all of the questions, but we will try to get through at least one or two.

Mr Mahoney: I will be brief. It was almost three dimensional as we were feeling the draft from the open door. It was making us think of the idea of north in real terms.

We are having some difficulty I guess as a people thinking in terms of pan-Canadian and that is a little bit of what this committee is about and what many of our deputations are about. Your presentation takes us on to a much

broader plane, a broader scale of ideas, and I appreciate that. But I have to ask you realistically how we talk in terms of pan-north when we cannot seem to get our act together to come to some pretty fundamental agreements about our own country. How do we make that quantum leap with any kind of credibility in the world with these other nations, going to them as a divided country?

Mr Alexander: What I am saying is, with the problem in front of us with relationships among the parts of Canada, to be specific Quebec and Ontario, that we ignore this commonality of north. Let us take the architecture of north, if you will. We have a great deal in common with Quebec, Montreal and Toronto as northern cities, that vast tunnel network underneath them. The architectural institute that has opened in Montreal, I think that is a shared interest in northern architecture that we have never exploited or exposed or even talked about.

So I am not here to decide what the future of Canada is, but I am here to say that there are some links that have never been made because of our northern psyche, and I would like to expose that.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Alexander.

DONALD R. MacDONALD

The Chair: I call next Donald MacDonald.

Mr MacDonald: Thank you, Mr Chair and committee members.

Idealism or realism: Confederation is defined as an alliance of political units. This committee in reality should be called the select committee on Ontario in a configuration called Canada, where the people have been divided for political gain by a power hungry, uncaring federal Conservative dictatorship. These federal idiots keep the whole scenario so complex and sidetracked with issues that almost no one, not even themselves, can figure out the whole picture because the people are unable to perceive what is occurring overall in Canada.

In Ontario's Human Rights Code the aim is to create at a community level a climate of understanding and mutual respect, in which all our people will be made to feel that all are equal in dignity and rights, that each is part of the whole Canadian community and that each has a rich contribution to make to the development and wellbeing of our province and nation. Few will disagree that this is a prerequisite for building a truly health Canadianism.

The federal ruling government pretends to be leading the nation for the good of the Canadian people, when in reality it is not. One glaring example of this reality occurs in a most essential area of Canadian life—agriculture, food processing and retailing. I as an Ontario farmer am expected to grow a crop of winter wheat that in March of this year will sell for a price of \$107 per metric tonne. The consumer purchases Shredded Wheat, a 450-gram box, by Nabisco in the grocery store at a price of from \$4,000 to over \$6,000 for the same basic tonne. I will emphasize that with this plain writing.

The processing and retailing companies have a markup price percentage of from 3,700% to 5,600% for themselves. Under free trade the price to the farmer went from \$7.10 a bushel in 1980 to \$2.90 a bushel in March 1991 or

41% of the 1980 price. This is a prime example of unethical consumerism robbery of the Canadian people by a multinational allowed by the government of Canada, which says it represents Canadians and their interests.

Canada mainly exports primary products from the soil, the forests, the water, the mines and some technology. The goods and services tax is to do away with the deficit. However, the deficit cannot be cleared away by allowing multinationals to profit by importing low-cost goods produced elsewhere. This is like treating the symptoms of our Canadian malaise without removing the cause of it.

We have priced ourselves out of our own market for manufactured goods allowing greed to rule. This greed for profit has allowed speculators to price our industrial, commercial, agricultural and housing lands at a far greater value than their real worth to society. Some wages and salaries are too much, as are interest and loan limit rates. Federal politicians increase their pay and pensions to astronomical levels while expecting the common person to accept less while living and operating costs increase. Jobs are being lost in Canada, and especially Ontario, for the sake of multinational profits. The Canadian government is a Robin Hood in reverse, taking from the common people to give to the foreign imperialists. The definition of a balanced budget is enough votes to be re-elected to power.

1640

Living close to the Rama reserve, I am somewhat familiar with life there. Our two daughters attended the day care on the reserve. The people on the reserve in only 150 years changed from the traditional native style of life to that of today, with neither their past or our present lifestyle values dominant, but rather a mix of lost souls, sometimes resenting past indignities. They struggle to find themselves and to learn to work the political system to acquire from it, in the greed-for-oneself style of today.

My family and I had to breathe the smoke from the reserve dump burning in 1989 at varying rates for up to almost two weeks. At that time, Doug Lewis was Minister of Justice for Canada. His secretary seemed to think that the smoke was all right for us to breathe. Indian Affairs minister Pierre Cadieux replied to my letter telling me no more than the local newspaper did the next day after the initial fire.

The reason for the fire was negligence of maintenance at the dump. Ideally the country should be returned to the original natives. However, realistically they are a people who should be standing on their own feet with the same treatment as any other Canadian, earning and paying a fair share of incomes to society. Human rights must prevail, whether it be Indian reserve or non-reserve lands involved, or people.

Ideally we should all speak at least three languages: English and French and one of either native, Gaelic, Italian, Chinese, Latin, Greek, Spanish, Portuguese or Japanese. Realistically French and English are official where numbers warrant. A true indication of the need for French in areas of Ontario is the number of requests received for it by this and other recent past committees of the present government. My father-in-law is French from Quebec and my nephew took French immersion in Toronto. Both have

abandoned French. It is a great ideology to speak French and English, but Canada cannot support the cost of forcing English-speaking people to speak French or vice versa. These costs include printing, education and the resentment cost to society.

Native was proposed in the public school and my daughters requested to study it. However, it did not occur. Linguistic minorities should not receive government funding.

In summation, we in Ontario and Canada cannot have our cake and eat it too. Ontario people as well as the people of Canada cannot have any real prosperity allowing multinationals to import low-cost imported goods produced elsewhere and have excessive consumerism profits. The whole federal Conservative game is to keep the scenario so complex and sidetracked with issues that almost no one can figure out the whole picture, because the people are unable to perceive what is really taking place overall.

Clearly the immoral actions of the federal government allowing the multinationals to profit while others in society starve financially has to end. Yes, to quote Mulroney from Tuesday, "You can't have it both ways," but get on the right financial track, Mr Mulroney.

This crime of treasonous, inhumane treatment on the agricultural and working sectors of Canada by the federal Conservatives must stop. If Ottawa will not act, then Ontario must provide leadership and take action. The last resort we have is to create Ontario as an independent nation.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much, Mr MacDonald, for your presentation and for providing to us a very clear example of some of the concerns that you have. The interesting point which you bring forward has been brought forward on a number of occasions, not zeroed in on the agricultural sector but certainly bringing forward the underlying principle that there are certain responsibilities now being looked at or handled by the federal government which are in many cases not being met.

You have brought forward one particular aspect and you have used the winter wheat and the processing of that as an example. I guess my question to you is, we recognize that in Quebec there is activity to gain further provincial powers which are now held by the federal government. Are you suggesting that in the area of agriculture in the province of Ontario, one possible role for the government of is to look at the agricultural interests to see whether they are in fact being addressed through interests such as yours, and if not, to make such a request to the federal government for protection or for responsibility in that area which is now in many ways provincial?

Mr MacDonald: Yes.

Mr Winniger: Mr MacDonald, we have covered a lot of territory in the last couple of weeks and we have heard a lot of delegations. Most of the delegations have directed their minds towards whether Quebec should stay in Confederation or not and should it assert its independence or sovereignty or various scenarios. You are one of the first that I can recall to suggest that the last resort is to create Ontario as an independent nation. Obviously you have probably given some thought to that scenario and I

am just wondering what kind of broader picture you would have of an independent Ontario, how it would relate to the other provinces of Canada and the federal government and other countries. Have you thought about that at all?

Mr MacDonald: To some degree. I could see it as just an independent country, independent from the eastern part of Canada, independent from the western part, independent from Quebec, independent from the United States, functioning within itself, rather than in this configuration we have.

Mr Winniger: Would it still have economic and cultural relations with the other parts of Canada? Have you thought about that?

Mr MacDonald: Oh, I think we cannot get away, that we are all part of Canada in a way, and no question about it, we would have economic and cultural considerations, just like Canada has with the United States and other countries at the present time. You cannot get away from that completely. But the problem is, my feeling is they are not running Canada for Canadians, for Canada.

Mr Winniger: So you would run an Ontario for Ontarians?

Mr MacDonald: Yes.

The Chair: We will stop there.

JOHN ELLIOTT

The Chair: I call next John Elliott. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Elliott: I was not sure if I was going to make it today. Our regional radio has been forecasting terrible blizzards, which suggested to me this morning that I might better stay home and off the road, but it has not really hit too hard yet and probably will not hit until tonight, so I am here. We just live about an hour from here over on the other side of Beaver Valley, right in ski country.

Good afternoon. My name is John Elliott. I would like to thank the committee for this opportunity to speak to your group, and I would like to congratulate you on the work you are doing. I am here as a concerned Canadian, facing what appears to be the imminent dissolution of our great country. I am not prepared to let this happen.

Who am I? I am a third-generation Canadian. My great-grandfather came over from Ireland in the mid-1800s, before Confederation, and settled in the Ottawa Valley. My grandfather moved to Sudbury with the railroad construction in 1883, which as we all know was the great Canadian dream of those days, and which as we all know led to the discovery of the nickel ore body which developed into one of the greatest in the world and put Canada on the map, so to speak. That location developed from nothing to the modern city that it is today, the capital of northern Ontario.

1650

My father, a First World War veteran, died last month at the age of 95 and I was fortunate to talk to him a week or so before he passed away. One question he asked me was, "Where are we going?" and I really could not answer him. I said, "I think it's up to you to decide where we are going."

I was born in the Depression in 1934. My mother held the maiden name of Lefebvre. Her parents had moved to Quebec via Hawkesbury to a place called Markstay outside of Sudbury. I am not sure how many generations on her side of the family, but if you go to Quebec City today and look in the phone book it is about 50% Lefebvres. So with this background I think I am probably as Canadian as anybody is today.

I am a father of five and a grandfather of four. I have been an independent businessman for the last 22 years. I am currently actively involved with the Life Underwriters Association of Canada in Owen Sound. I am their president and I had the occasion of going to the annual general meeting last year in Montreal and this year in Toronto.

It is a pretty impressive organization, but I came away from the first meeting feeling very sad because the province of Quebec had virtually kicked them out of Quebec and had legislated under certain constitutional powers, which they devised were accurate, that the Life Underwriters Association of Canada no longer had any authority in the area of education for our industry. They legislated a new organization which is completely government controlled. The sad part of it was that this organization, I think, was glad to see it happen because they had had such difficulty over eight or 10 years or more in communication and in getting along and in trying to solve their problems. That is the sad part.

Why am I here today? Because I believe in Canada and I believe in the Canadian dream. Without the vision of our forefathers we would not be what we are today. I see it as a challenge. I believe that Quebec is an integral part of Canada and should not leave. We must continue to struggle and build on the strong foundation that we have. Canada is a great Dominion from sea to sea, but it is more than just a land. It is a spirit of freedom, love and integrity, of industry, peace and goodwill, values and principles which we must protect and cultivate.

As part of my legacy, I discovered in some of the things that my mother left behind a copy of the *Globe*, 1 July 1867, Confederation day, a fascinating piece of newspaper, only four pages, only \$6 per annum. But let me just note something here. They comment on our history, on the discovery of Canada generally attributed to Jacques Cartier. He discovered America in 1534. We have all learned that in our history classes, I am sure.

The derivation of the term "Canada," according to the *Globe* on 1 July 1867, came from an Indian phrase, Aca Nada, meaning, "Here is nothing." It was otherwise interpreted as meaning in the Iroquois language "village or collection of houses" which Cartier believed to be applied to the village of Stadacona, which is situated on the site where Quebec City now stands. So Canada is nothing, right from the beginning.

This past summer, just after the failure of Meech Lake and the Oka crisis, I suffered a minor disability and had time to do some reading and reflection on these major events and the significance of our political and economic history which brought us to this point of time.

Of course to have an idea of where we are going, we have to understand where we have been. Referring to some

of the statistics that are quoted in this issue of the *Globe*, they are rather interesting. Four provinces formed the original Confederation: Upper Canada, Lower Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In terms of population, Ontario was almost equally in balance with Quebec, which is pretty well true today.

They went on to do a little further analysis and they broke the population down in terms of religious affiliation and in terms of their native land, where they were born, about three million people. The breakdown of religious affiliation puts the Church of Rome well at the top with 44.4%; Presbyterians come in behind with 15%; the Church of England had 15%, and then the rest of them just go down the scale—Methodists, Baptists, Lutherans, Congregationalists and all others. That was pretty important stuff in those days.

The breakdown, the classification by occupation, was revealing stuff: farmers, right at the top, 320,000; labourers, including lumbermen, next; and the rest of them get smaller—mechanics, trade and commerce, professional, a very small number of professional people. But farmers are right up there at the top. Most of the people are farming in 1867.

Fascinating comments on Ontario, referred to as Upper Canada: "In respect of climate and soil there is perhaps no country in the world better adapted than Upper Canada for the pursuits of husbandry. Already it takes a high rank among the countries which are distinguished as producers of the great staples of human food and as its population increases and more of its soil is brought under a thorough cultivation, the amount of agricultural produce it will raise for home consumption and for export will doubtless be vastly augmented. Probably for many years to come, the chief source of wealth and of employment to its population in this section of the Dominion will be found, as at present, in the pursuits of agriculture."

Am I running out of time?

The Chair: Yes. You are actually at the end now. I will give you a minute to sum up, if you will.

Mr Elliott: Okay. Prime Minister Mulroney said quite simply, as quoted in the *Globe* and *Mail* 13 February, "Canada is too valuable to be thrown away and the federal government will fight to save it."

On the concept of nationhood, we seem to have evolved to a point where the Québécois, the Quebecers, think of themselves as a nation, not as Canadians but Québécois. Can you imagine Louis St Laurent as anything but a great Canadian? How about Jean Beliveau or Rocket Richard? These are great Canadians.

1700

How has this situation evolved on the political front? Self-serving politicians and pliable media anxious to project anything violent, exciting and new—René Lévesque. Why does this brand of politics have to continue? It is the reason many Canadians are saying now: "We are fed up with this bickering. Let them go." A very bad attitude. Just as in a family quarrel, this can lead to dire consequences in the heat of an argument. We need, once again, understanding, patience, a renewal of commitment to a worthy goal. We

are not finished building a great country. Let's get on with the job.

What about Ontario? One must adhere to those principles. We must adhere to those principles and play a leadership role, ie, we must protect Confederation.

Briefly, under political factors, again we have to look at history vis-à-vis federal Liberal power and Ontario provincial Conservative power. Deals and tradeoffs to maintain power and the status quo have no doubt been carried out for many years. The change began about 23 years ago with the entry of the Trudeau Liberals. Seven years ago the balance of power changed federally to the Conservatives, and the key was Quebec. It has always been Quebec. At the same time as the Liberals took power, the Ontario Conservatives lost out. Who really knows the intricacies of this power shift, but you can be sure that religion and culture played a major role.

The Chair: Mr Elliott, I am sorry, I am going to have to ask you to stop at that point.

Mr Elliott: Can I have 10 more seconds? That is all I have.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr Elliott: The Prime Minister himself has said that we are grossly overgoverned. This is very expensive. I am talking here on the economic side. We have now reached a crisis point where our debt level is crippling our ability to support our level of social programs. We have to address this problem and solve it very soon, and it may well be linked to whatever restructuring of government results from this current situation. Indeed, it is imperative for us to survive in the emerging global economy. We must adapt and change. We must negotiate to protect our values. Thank you.

The Chair: If you would like to leave us a copy of your written presentation or if you want to send it to us, we would appreciate receiving it.

Mr Elliott: Would it be all right if I sent it to you? I was a little short of time preparing it and it is just a little rough around the edges.

The Chair: That is fine. Please do send it to us. Thank you.

CLAYTON LONG

The Chair: I call next Clayton Long.

Mr Long: The lights are pretty bright. I did not expect all of this. I left a copy with the chap at the front entrance, so I assume that somewhere along the line you will receive a copy of what I am about to say.

I am Clayton Long. I am proprietor of a small business in this general area and pleased to take part in this forum of collecting information and ideas. I think the average Canadian, whether from east, west or north, wants about the same things, that is, family, good-paying jobs, plenty to eat, good housing and good recreation. When this goal is reached we become pretty complacent and thus, I think, in this country become the silent majority.

When this pattern is disturbed by family crisis, job loss or possibly aroused by politicians, we can be led to believe that things should be changed. One such situation has

caused the people from Quebec and the rest of Canada to be polarized by self-serving and egotistical politicians on both sides who seem to put their careers and a chance to get into a history book ahead of the wishes of the people who elected them.

From the little I understand of the 20 years before the American Civil War, if the people on both sides had realized the manipulation by political forces and the pain they were about to inflict on themselves and the country as a whole, I believe there would never have been an American Civil War. I recognize that change was needed then and also needed now, but please do not let us be led to the brink by our leaders with the issues that have been placed in front of us.

Through my adult life I have read and heard about the francophone-Canada issues, including the strife of 1970, and still to this day I hope there will be a way to keep this country together. I have worked and associated with many different nationalities in Canada and have friends of French Canadian background who have never caused me anxiety because they spoke to each other in their native tongue or taught their children their native language and customs within Canada. And I hope most French Canadian people can say the same thing. I think they should practise the same laws and have the same privileges in French Quebec as we do in English Canada, and where our safety is concerned, like road signs, etc, in both languages, which is to say I think we should maintain the status quo.

I believe that shots taken by all sides in the constitutional issue do not serve Canada well. Therefore, I suggest that the federal and provincial politicians should not push further negotiations in the near future and, if it is possible at this time, to turn away from this issue and focus on many other important issues facing Canadians. In my opinion, if this Quebec issue is pushed by the present political powers on both sides, we could actually destroy this country as we now know it for ever.

It seems to me that when this Constitution is finally settled it will require all provincial parties working much more co-operatively towards the common goal than we have seen this past year.

I consider myself very average when it comes to listening to two or three platforms about a single issue and then making a decision. I say to you it is not easy being an elector when subjected to campaigns by politicians and Rhodes scholars, and I do admit that I have been swayed one way then another.

It is curious to me that at a time when Canada and Quebec seem to be growing apart, our mother countries, that is, England, France, Germany, Italy, etc, seem to be growing together on some of these very issues. May I suggest that we in Ontario pursue some other important issues like government spending, deficits, energy policies and energy conservation, the environment, North American trade, world trade, housing and agriculture, and if these issues can be dealt with while a cooling-out period takes place on the Constitution then maybe a better time will present itself to renew negotiations.

I did say that I consider myself very average as a citizen. Therefore, I do not have clear answers to all the aforementioned subjects, but I will comment briefly.

If we are going to have economic recovery and inflation below 5%, why does government spending continue to grow at a higher rate? There must be a strategy developed to lower the deficit in Ontario and also in Canada, and I do not believe a good strategy exists.

An energy policy should be established quickly, if it is possible. Oil prices could fall to new lows on world markets. This policy should be a federal policy, but Ontario could show some leadership, possibly suggesting a floor price for crude to protect the bit of drilling and exploration that remains in North America.

Energy conservation to date has been given lipservice but could be a huge factor in our long-term hydro development. Such things as energy-efficient construction, heat pumps, fluorescent lights, efficient appliances, to date need further promotion and could be done within existing establishments like Ontario Hydro, the Ministry of Energy and the private sector.

Recycling and waste management has been introduced to most areas but much more can be done to encourage further development for waste products, and also education to reduce initial volumes and reuse some of our products. I wonder if the waste that must be put in landfill could be put in one place in this province so that it could be a future coal mine, oil well, whatever you would call it. I suspect our waste will have some potential somewhere down the road.

Whether or not free trade suits the government of Ontario, I think the floodgates were opened two years ago, and this is the time to be constructive rather than taint the process with negative comments and actions.

1710

Rent control in Ontario has turned out to be a pretty long-term policy for such a short-term fix. I think the government of Ontario could do a lot to improve the situation for both the landlord and tenant. If it is true that rent increases are being denied for work that was in progress or contracted and then frozen by retroactive legislation, then I say this government has been very unfair to some landlords and should move quickly to right this situation.

A strong policy to encourage first-time home ownership could alleviate pressure to create more rental housing. Also, encourage municipalities to rezone to allow granny flats in some of the huge homes that have been built in the last 10 years.

Streamline the planning and development process to allow land to reach markets when it is needed to offset spiralling prices when supply has become short. I realize this last statement is dreaming, but every government has talked about a shorter process and then made the process longer. Maybe this government could reverse this.

I do not have any suggestions to improve agriculture, but some major changes need to be made to keep the poor farming community on the land. There must be several ways to improve their standing in our economy.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your very insightful presentation. You brought up many issues. You are saying we should maybe hold on the Constitution and focus on some other issues. You mentioned energy, the environment, housing and a variety of other topics. As politicians, with what is happening in Quebec right now and with the pressures that are on us by the population, how could we possibly postpone discussions on the Constitution? For example, this committee is a reaction to what the citizens want, and that is what we are here to gather. I would like to know why and how you would suggest we put off looking at the Constitution.

Mr Long: From my point of view, I see the politicians on really three fronts who dominate the media right now, and I would say they are the Bloc québécois, also the Bourassa Liberals and our Conservative federal government. They all seem to be at odds with each other and the more issues that are introduced into the discussion seem to create further widening apart on agreement. It may be impossible to walk away from it at this time or to slow it down, but it seems to me that agreement cannot be achieved by the parties in power at this time. Therefore, I suggest that if there is a way we can cool it down, maybe in an unspecified period of time, whether it be two, three, four years, maybe it can be reintroduced by people who are able to win the confidence of the people.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Long.

REBECCA MARSHALL

Ms Marshall: Ladies and gentlemen of the committee and ladies and gentlemen of the audience, good evening, happy Valentine's Day. I am Rebecca Marshall. It is my pleasure to have the opportunity to make this presentation before you. My brief is longer than 10 minutes, so I am going to highlight the main concepts. Please feel free to read the entire brief at your leisure. I wish there had been more time, but here goes.

This meeting is for Canadian citizens to express their opinions, hopes and desires on Confederation. In doing so, the rest of Canada must earnestly listen to these voices. I fear for the continued existence of Canada without a true Constitution of and by the people of Canada.

The confederation of many people must be a strong desire to be united for many reasons, a desire to reflect common values and common rights and common freedoms that all of society wants, needs and demands. Canada, besides being a vast land mass, is also made up of people, ordinary and extraordinary people, who wish to call this land home. In my home I want fairness and justice, equality, honesty. What I do not want is one part of the family getting special treatment. This is unfair. It makes me angry and it makes me feel less important than the favoured one.

I belong to a group of people who have the same values, the same desires, the same hunger for a free and democratic nation that allows a person to work hard towards making a better life, and I believe that Canada is losing this. We must have less complicated ways of government which would lessen the bureaucracy. We cannot afford this any more. We must get our house in order, especially our

finances. I suggest more weight be given the Auditor General's recommendations.

We have multiculturalism and we have bilingualism. How do you achieve unity by these two concepts? They are in total opposition to the idea of uniting many parts into a nation. They in reality splinter and divide a nation. We are all individuals. A nation is a group of individuals who wish to live together for common reasons. Is our government so blinded by bowing to the demands of minority groups that it cannot see that what we have in common is so much more important than what it is that separates and divides us?

If we want Canada to remain then it is up to us, the people who must put forth ideas and demands and show the government how. I think the government, in its expensive ivory tower, has forgotten the basic concept of democracy.

A new Charter of Rights and Freedoms which guarantees rights to own property and to be able to protect that property—I want to see ancient democratic right of trial before courts of law that are independent of government interference. I suggest elected judges.

Women, who happen to make up over 50% of Canada's present population, demand equality before the law in government, based on majority alone.

Forced bilingualism is within the present charter. I ask that it be removed from the charter, thereby eliminating it from the new Constitution. Language and the policing of language are in alienation to the freedom of expression. Let it be understood, only by the fact that the majority of Canadians speak and operate in English, that English be the present working language within the courts and the jurisdiction of the federal government, and within those provinces by majority use. It is not to be included in the Constitution of this country.

The rights and freedoms and the importance of the individual have been lost. We must create a Parliament where those rights and freedoms again become the cornerstone of our nation. If the rights and freedoms of the individual are protected by our laws, by our government and by our Parliament, then society as a group of individuals will be protected and allowed to flourish.

Things I suggest are:

That the elected Speaker of the House have more power to reform legislative timetables;

The constituency offices elect their candidate, who does not require the signature of the party leader in order to run an election;

Recall of an elected member, if that elected member goes against the wishes and demands of the majority of his or her constituency. The only exception would be the Prime Minister.

The Senate is to be elected, equal and effective, so that all provinces and regions have an even regional distribution of power;

Party whips would have less power to mete out punishment to those party representatives who seek the constituency's betterment over their party's policies. The people of Canada must have responsible peers from all walks of life elected to Parliament to govern them, not just professionals.

When the Constitution of the people of Canada is written, that it be written in a language for the people and the understanding of the average Canadian—it must be written so the average Canadian can read and understand and grasp the concepts for which it was written; that it is a declaration of who the Canadian people are, what are the common desires they all share, especially those of personal freedoms and rights; and that it explains to all citizens democracy and how democracy controls and limits government.

I suggest that all constitutional briefs and presentations be sent to a non-partisan constitutional assembly, where a draft be created, and to be redrafted until ratified by 70% of the eligible Canadian voters.

1720

I have not spoken on provincial relationships to the federal government, nor the power struggle that this entails. Canada will naturally develop into regions. These provinces or regions must realize that executive-centred governments are irresponsible, inefficient, self-serving and that they do an injustice to the people they serve and represent. Please decentralize your power and controls. Return some of the provincial power to the municipalities.

Next, as far as that goes, I go to the postscript to the presentation because I am running out of time. This is with regard to the Quebec separation or the possibility thereof. I wish to thank Quebec for having the courage to finally display its desires and demands. If Canada only had such fortitude. It is now up to the rest of Canada, which is not just the federal government, to answer these demands in a clear, sober manner that states exactly how we are to handle Quebec.

Let us be perfectly honest with the people of Canada, especially Quebec, by laying our cards on the table. Just what is involved in a separate Quebec? And I insist on a separate Quebec, no sovereignty-association. Borders, defence, immigration, currency; the whole mixture of creating a new country must be adopted by Quebec. What of Quebec's borders? Labrador is not in the equation. Neither is the northern section, nor possibly the centre section since both were deeded to the Dominion of Canada.

So what do we have left? A small portion of Quebec which, with its share of the national debt plus payment of the assets of the federal buildings and properties which will be owed to the rest of Canada, leaves little for its GNP. Do not forget the loss of revenue from a federal employer. A lot of Quebecers will be out of work.

Speaking of finances, Quebec has tourism. They also have a good manufacturing base at present which will eventually flow east, west and particularly south. Their natural resources will be diminished as Canada appropriates the two sections of land owing to Canada. Realizing that, what can Quebec sell and exactly who to? Quebec will be enclosed in a North American continent which speaks predominantly English. All or most goods and services will be in English, but what of imports? Do you really think the rest of the North American people will worry about double-labelling or the expense of that on products to sell to six million people in relation to 400 million? I hardly think so. I suppose Quebec could import mainly from France and other French-speaking countries.

I truly feel sorry for average Quebecers. They have been led down the proverbial garden path by a few fanatical, insecure, sometimes irrational, elite leaders who will lessen their quality of life. The bluff has finally been called and the spoilt child runs away. I suggest 5 to 10 years before Quebec asks to rejoin Canada, if not the United States of America, but it will be on the larger and stronger's conditions and terms.

If Quebec somehow succeeds as an independent country, then I wish it continued success and happiness, and I truly mean that. At least Canada and those who desire a contented, united country based on equality can become closer and develop a stabilizing, happy relationship. This will allow Canada to focus on more important issues which have previously been shelved.

Thank you for hearing me.

Ms Churley: I do not have much time so I cannot ask you questions I would like. I would like to focus in particular on your last statement on Quebec.

There are other provinces that we tend to forget about because the focus is on Quebec right now, which are having, particularly the west, extreme problems with the central government and the rest of Canada and not only with Quebec. Why do you think that if Quebec separates completely all our problems will go away and we will be able to solve them? Do you not think the west will see what Quebec is doing and then start chipping away and making more and more demands? Do you not think we are going to have to all work on this together or we will continue to have similar problems from other provinces?

Ms Marshall: I really think, since Quebec right at this point is the dividing part of this country, it is either going to be Quebec or the west. You choose. Somebody is going to leave and for my money I would rather it be Quebec than someone else who has more of our common basis for sharing. I am aware, but that is my opinion.

Mr Mahoney: Just an interesting twist of a comment that was made to the committee of our Legislature following the death of Meech: Professor John Crispo came before our committee and his answer to the question of why Quebec is acting this way, which I guess is a question many English Canadians have asked, was, "Picture yourself one of six million English-speaking people on a continent of 400 million French-speaking people."

Ms Marshall: Would you say the same thing to—

Mr Mahoney: Let me finish.

Ms Marshall: Sorry.

Mr Mahoney: I am not being argumentative. I am trying to point out something that you have said in almost a reverse sense. He said, "Picture yourself as one of six million anglophones among 400 million francophones. Might you be nervous about losing your identity?" Your comment in your postscript is, "Do you really think the rest of North America will worry about the expense of double-labelling products to sell to six million people out of 400 million?" It is exactly the same point Crispo was making and the answer is no, they would not worry about it. I think you have hit on a point in almost a perverse way, that that is exactly what Quebec is worried about.

My question to you would be, do we have any responsibility as a country, assuming Quebec is today part of Canada and has been all along, to try to understand why French Canadians have that fear that was expressed in one sense by Crispo and in another sense by your statement?

Ms Marshall: My point is that the rest of Canada has been preoccupied with worrying about what Quebec feels. Do you imagine that the Italian group or the Chinatown syndrome down in Toronto really experiences that problem? They are not a founding nation. They were defeated and this is the basic problem, I think. They cannot face defeat. I am sorry. I think we have gone too far over backwards to please them.

Mr Mahoney: You do not accept that the French people are one of the two founding cultures?

Ms Marshall: No, I do not. Sorry.

Mr Mahoney: All right. Thank you.

The Chair: Very briefly, Mr Harnick.

Mr Harnick: I have asked this question to other people who have said essentially what you have said. What is going to happen when you have now removed Quebec in the unequivocal way in which you have removed it? What is going to happen to the \$30 billion of trade between Ontario and Quebec? What is going to happen to all the jobs of people who live in Ontario, maybe in Ottawa and Collingwood, when that \$30 billion worth of trade goes south, as you describe? What are you going to say to all these people who no longer have jobs?

Ms Marshall: This problem that you are talking about has nothing to do with Quebec. Actually, it has to do with the federal government as well as provincial governments when they set up the free trade. They never worked on the equation of how come we are 30% higher in taxes—

Mr Harnick: No.

Ms Marshall: Yes, it is.

Mr Harnick: That is not what I am asking you though. What I am asking you is this. At this present moment, Ontario and Quebec do \$30 billion in business with one another. If we accept your plan and Quebec leaves this country in the unequivocal way in which you set out, it may decide to take its business elsewhere. We are now going to lose a portion of a \$30 billion trade.

Ms Marshall: And I am saying we are not.

Mr Harnick: Where are you going to get it back?

Ms Marshall: Where is Quebec going to sell? If you take away two thirds—

Mr Harnick: They will sell what they are selling now to New York state.

Ms Marshall: No, they will not.

Mr Harnick: Why not?

Ms Marshall: Because you are taking away two thirds of the land mass. Where are they going to get these natural resources, especially the ones dealing with Labrador, which belongs to Newfoundland?

Mr Harnick: So you are going to strip them clean and then kick them out.

Ms Marshall: That is the choice. It is not kicking them out. It is their decision.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Marshall.

Could I just check again to see if Brenda Anstey or anyone else from the Lovesick Lake Native Women's Association is here. I gather they are not. Okay. Then what I am going to suggest we do is, I could ask if they do arrive if someone would let me know. In the meantime, I am going to suggest we proceed with the list of people that were added to the list of speakers, but with the proviso that in order to get through those people, people try to keep their comments to about five minutes, and with the understanding as well that if the other group does arrive, we will then go to them at that point in time.

1730

GORDON TRANTER

The Chair: I invite Gordon Tranter to come forward.

Mr Tranter: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the select committee on Confederation, my name is Gordon Stanley Tranter and I am a Canadian from Ontario. What I am about to say will deal with the federal and provincial governments.

I would like to see our country stay together from sea to sea but only under the following condition: each and every province and territory is equal in the Constitution with no special status for any one province or territory. I will now discuss several main topics and possible solutions.

1. Governments: It is obvious that our system of government is not working. It does not represent the majority. We are being ruled by a minority. Let me give a simplistic example. Take 10 voters and three candidates. Candidate A receives four votes, candidate B receives three votes and candidate C receives three votes. Obviously the winner is the one that got the four votes, or 40% of the population, but in reality 60% of the people have not voted for him. What we need are runoff elections for true representation by majority which is costly, I realize, but a true indication of who we want to represent us.

2. Referenda: Why not make use of referenda on, say, 5 or 10 major issues every five years? For example, capital punishment, abortion, the environment, 51% Canadian ownership, state-run education, law and order, health systems, free trade, gun legislation, immigration, bilingualism, etc.

Articles could be run in major newspapers by leading experts in the field as to the pros and cons of the proposed topics for a year before the vote to enable voters to make a wise decision. Let us say 60% gives the government power to enact legislation, between 40% and 59% puts legislation over for five years and with 39% the topic is defeated. These are merely arbitrary percentages.

3. The Senate: Let us abolish the Senate completely. It is unnecessary and merely serves as patronage plums for losing politicians and party faithfuls. It is no longer relevant.

4. Language: This is a tough one. I am offering a solution at this point. Leave Quebec as a major French-language province with English as a second language. Leave all the other provinces using English as a major language with French as a second language. But make it mandatory for

every child from kindergarten to university to study and be fluent in both these languages, even if they require remedial classes. At the end of 25 or 30 years allow these students their own referendum: (a) keep the status quo, Quebec French and other provinces English, (b) Canada becomes completely bilingual or (c) cancel the whole program.

Now bear me out. I realize this is putting off our language dispute, but by this time many of our older citizens with language prejudice will have passed on and a new generation will have a better understanding of the situation.

5. Biculturalism: Scrap the legislation. It is divisive. People that come to Canada want to be Canadians. We should reinforce that we are Canadians with a different heritage: Canadians with Italian background, not Italian Canadians; Canadians with an English background, not English Canadians; Canadians with a French background, not French Canadians; Canadians with a Japanese background, not Japanese Canadians. If people want to retain their heritage and language, it should be done, but at their own time and at their own expense.

6. Law and order: A society is a group of people bound together by laws for the common good, and 85% to 90% of the population obey the laws of this land, but we are being held ransom by 15% of the population. It is called the tyranny of the minority. The courts, the judges, the penal systems, the parole system and legislative lawmakers have failed the people of this country and are not protecting the citizens of the land.

How can anyone respect a legal system when Supreme Court judges rule that people charged with a crime are being set free because it contravenes the Charter of Rights and Freedoms? Does not the charter also protect the victims by giving them the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness and the right to have criminals prosecuted? Why can a man, a woman or a child not walk free at any time of the day or night without the fear of being attacked, robbed, raped, assaulted and killed in this country? I know this is not going on all the time, but it certainly is becoming much stronger. How can we respect the Supreme Court when the members rule that if you are over 65 you must retire but they can remain until they are 75 years of age?

The Young Offenders Act: When young people are 12 years or older, they know right from wrong, particularly if they are 16 and can obtain a driver's licence. Why are they given special privileges when they commit a crime? If we do not want them in with hardened criminals, put them in juvenile prisons, teach them a trade, but make them serve terms to fit the crime. Let us enact legislation for law and order and make this country safe to live in.

7. Taxes: Money collected as taxes should only be on income with no deductions whatsoever. The higher the income, of course, the higher the percentage, and this would simplify and reduce the cost of collecting taxes.

8. Religion: There should be a public-funded school system only. We are wasting all kinds of tax dollars operating dual systems and building separate educational centres of administration. Religion should be taught in churches and homes. Perhaps the tax dollars could be sent to the health care system.

9. Native Canadians: Why do we continually send money to underdeveloped countries and ignore the plight of our aboriginal people? Is it because underdeveloped countries purchase our industrial products? Why not find out what the native people would like to do to become self-sufficient? Native Canadians were and are the first real environmentalists. Could they not be educated for jobs in natural resources, reforestation and parks? Would they not be perfect in this type of work? We must help them to become self-sufficient. Can we give them trades training in the reserve to build their homes, etc?

I would like to thank this committee for the opportunity of appearing here today to express my concerns regarding the direction in which my country is going, and yours too, and the apparent lack of concerned leadership.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. We will make sure that members of the committee get copies of the entire brief.

JOE HART

The Chair: I call Joe Hart.

Mr Hart: I did not bring with me a prepared text but I will attempt to keep it brief. I came with some thoughts on what I feel we should have for a country, not something divided.

The question is asked: What is a Canadian? When I was a young fellow going to school, we did not seem to have such a thing. I can recall when I was asked, "What are you?" and I said "I am a Canadian," they would say, "No, where does your father come from?" Well, five generations ago he came from Ireland, so that made me some person of Irish descent. Thankfully we have moved along a long way since those days.

Some of the things that really bother me about us as Canadians is that we seem to be taking a real negative attitude. We have heard negative approaches, some this afternoon, some that I have listened to and watched on Ontario television, some from the national debate that is going on. I think that until we can get back to a positive approach on what we want as Canadians and get away from what we have lost in the Meech Lake accord—we keep hearing it brought up. Believe me, it is dead, it is gone, it will not come back, so that is something we have lost and should not dwell on.

We should build on what we really have. What are these? Confederation. The building of the rail from coast to coast. There are a couple of the things we do not like to consider as having built our country, but really did, and they are the First World War and the Second World War, which made us a strong nation. There is our role worldwide as a peacekeeping nation.

1740

One of the things I feel we are getting with that is very negative. I am hearing it more and more, all the time, that if you are from anywhere in Canada except Quebec, you are called English or an English Canadian. References to people from Quebec are either Québécois or federalist. But in the last two months I do not think I have heard anybody refer to them or themselves as Canadians, when in fact the people of Quebec are Canadians.

I know a great many of them who consider themselves to be Canadians, but constantly in the media the word is dropped. I live in Collingwood. I like the town. I live in Ontario. I like the province. I am not even sure if I were trying to define myself as a person of Ontario if I would be an Ontarian, Ontoronian or what it would be. I am a Canadian.

Another thing that kind of bothers me is that we have heard just lately of the report that has just been issued from the Quebec standpoint, that we should be relinquishing 22 of the federal strengths to Quebec. Maybe it is possible that Quebec needs something stronger to put us together as a nation, but if Quebec's shopping list is 22 items, how long is Ontario's, Manitoba's, Alberta's, Prince Edward Island's? Every region of the country will find it needs something different. How can we possibly have a strong Canada without a strong federal government?

I know some things need to be changed. Exactly what they are, I do not know, but I cannot see tearing the federal government apart to the point that every province runs its own little state. Alberta is afraid of Ontario; they keep telling us so. But what are they afraid of? They are afraid of mighty Toronto. They do not seem to be bothered and you never hear them talk about the other parts of the province. "It's Toronto we're afraid of." As a matter of fact they even tell us it is Bay Street. This, from coast to coast, seems to be a problem.

I would hope that we will start working together to drop this regionalistic approach to being Canadians and come together more as a nation. What that entails, that is what we elect you fellows to do.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Hart.

TERRENCE RODGERS

The Chair: I invite next Terrence Rodgers.

Mr Rodgers: Thank you for inviting me. Briefly, and I will be quick about this, we have had a busy day but I bought the committee a Valentine's Day present today. This is for you. It is chocolates for coming and also to let you know that in spite of the bashing of Quebec and politicians, I happen to be someone who loves Quebec. I love politicians for all the baloney you people have to put up with from people like us, but nevertheless it is your job and I know you enjoy doing it.

I am a businessman. I am a tourist operator here in Collingwood. I run something called the Scenic Caves and Caverns next to Blue Mountain. Interestingly enough, in 1631 the man who discovered Quebec spent two months up at the scenic caves. His name was Samuel de Champlain. Interestingly enough, this whole Collingwood area, also known as the Georgian Triangle Tourist Association and Convention Bureau—Meaford, Stayner, Wasaga, Collingwood, the Creemore area—really originally was populated by French settlers from the province of Quebec. But we have had enough discussion, I think, today on Quebec. Let's talk about Ontario's role in Canada, and why you are here.

I am disappointed, I might say, in the citizens of this area today for not having supported your wonderful committee and not turned out in larger numbers. At the same time I am somewhat disappointed in your own committee

for not having spent enough money to advertise the fact that this meeting is on today. A lot of people never knew about it. I picked it up in the *Globe and Mail* this morning. I would like you, over the next few weeks, to put a few more dollars into your communications budget so that more citizens of Ontario can at least listen or have a chance to say what they want.

My background is that I was a former—I sound like a sinful fellow—vice-president of a liquor company, a vice-president of a pharmaceutical company, assistant general manager of the Canadian National Exhibition and an entrepreneur and promoter.

Think of the western part of this country. In my bag here I have a booklet, which I have read, called the Reform Party of Canada. It goes back there where I think it belongs, as far as I am concerned; very strong in western Canada, but I do not think it is going to help keep Canada together. We have to grow on what we have had over the last 125 years. We have some problems. We have some bilingual problems, but the only way we are going to work together is improving what we have.

We do not want Quebec to separate, no way. We do not want to be different from Quebec, but having been born in Quebec and educated in Quebec and *je parle français un peu*, we have to realize that Quebec is somewhat different from the rest of Canada through its linguistic nature, and also that 30% of the people in Quebec are not of French-Canadian background.

How do we solve it? I am going to give you one idea today. I would like to see, either through some department or through the Lions Club or the Rotary, or someone across Ontario, set up something called *échange de familles*, exchange of families. Here in Ontario—eight million people, probably three million households—let's get every household in Ontario to write a letter to people in Quebec, invite them to stay for four or five days in Collingwood, Sarnia, London, or someone to enjoy our hospitality, to enjoy the fact that we are brothers and we love each other and can get along. Then maybe a year later they will invite us back to Quebec to enjoy the beautiful Laurentians and the beautiful Gaspé and the wonderful city of Montreal and Quebec City.

I am going to do my damndest to keep it together, because I think Canada is well worth saving. It has a lot going for it. We have to think of our future, of our children and our grandchildren. You people are not going to be politicians in a number of years and I want to say this, that we have to carry on and hand our children a legacy of a united Canada in spite of all the problems.

There are no problems in Canada. When you look at the rest of the world, they are all getting together, in Germany and the Balkans and overseas. In the Middle East they are trying to solve their problems. We in Canada, I tell you, should get up every morning, be thankful and pray to God that we have the country we have, and especially on Valentine's Day, love your country.

Any questions?

The Chair: No, I think that was quite clear.

Mr Winninger: When do we get to open the valentine?

Mr Mahoney: Do you want to run for office?

Mr Rodgers: Just in passing, I would like you to know that I have had the pleasure to spend an hour in one-to-one conversations with some great politicians in Canada and I respect you for your honesty, integrity and hard work. I have sat down with some great Prime Ministers in this country, like Pearson, Diefenbaker, Trudeau and even Mulroney. I have sat with some great Premiers in Ontario, like Bill Davis and lately with Bob Rae, and I want to tell you that every time I sit down with any of them for an hour and have a man-to-man talk, I would vote for all of them.

MARGARET DAWSON

The Chair: I invite next Margaret Dawson.

Ms Dawson: Good afternoon. My brief is probably the shortest. I was not aware that you were going to be here either, so there are only a couple of points that I have touched on.

My feeling for Canada was that of great pride. Canada was a place where all nationalities could live together and care about each other. I thought it was great that all people of all nations could come here and be respected for their backgrounds and beliefs.

It is with a lot of sorrow and apprehension that I find Canada changing to a country that I no longer understand. We as Canadians, because of our tolerance, are losing our own identity. The very few traditions that were Canadian are and have been changed. Because of minority rights, we the English-speaking majority, whether you realize it or not, are becoming the ones discriminated against. I feel that the majority no longer has a say in what their future might entail for fear that a minority group would take offence.

1750

I would like to speak briefly on language. I know that French and English are the official languages of Canada. I do not think all the provinces should be made bilingual. My thoughts on this are mostly due to the fact that we do have many different nationalities living here. To me, it would make more sense and less resistance if a second or third language was to be learned because of want and not demand.

An example of this would be if I lived in northern Ontario where the Indian population is greater. I think it would be great to maybe learn their language. I think our education system could without great difficulty teach other languages. In most areas this could make better, if not stronger ties in the community. This should not be forced on people, but given as an alternative.

Because I did not know until yesterday that you would be here, I have just had time to note a couple of my thoughts. I would like to close in saying you cannot have people respect and love one another on demand. I would say that this would only bring the opposite result and therefore defeat your purposes. Please have a referendum about these most important issues facing Canada.

SHAUNA KENDRY

The Chair: I invite next Shauna Kendry.

Ms Kendry: Good evening to the committee members. My name is Shauna Kendry and I work for Break Down the Barriers, which is an organization for disabled people in integrating them into the community.

I moved or relocated here from Hamilton and when I moved here I saw that services in the community were not that accessible, especially or more so for deaf people. As I have looked around I have noticed we have a lack of interpreting services available. We have to get interpreters in from the Huronia hearing-impaired program, and that only staffs one person, and it is too great an area for them, as well as from the Canadian Hearing Society and the Ontario Interpreting Services. We have great difficulty in getting interpreters, and deaf people have great frustrations in accessing interpreters in this area, as well as in other areas of Ontario.

Also, here in the community, many people are not aware of the bus service and access to that. We have lack of access to communication. Regarding telephone access, we need more telecommunications devices for the deaf, and we need more closed-captioning services and programs, as well as communication and basic literacy skills among our population.

In talks with the deaf community, we need to have more information available regarding the tax system, such as GST, as well as the provincial tax system. We need explanations that would actually clarify a lot of this information to the deaf community.

The next issue is human rights. Many deaf people have difficulty in this area, in that they are employed by people who are not deaf and communication does not occur. We need to encourage the employers, as well as colleagues of deaf people, to enter into sign language classes and evening programs so that deaf people can have access to work.

The next issue is regarding education and we need to have some acknowledgement of American sign language as well as the culture of deaf people, and to have teachers who themselves are deaf, as well as guidance counsellors, because they can provide the communication to deaf children, as well as be role models. Those hearing people who are going to be involved in this profession need to be able to speak the language that we use, not an artificial demonstration of English. Children need to have access to the communication, and to receive an artificial mode does not access education to them. So we need to increase this representation.

My next point, again with the deaf community, is with regard to employment. Many deaf people are concerned with regard to their limited education and their employment. Police stations need to have accessibility, as well as hospitals, by implementing or installing TDDs. Mountain skiing, as well as other resorts that people have access to, need to install TDDs. We need to have weather stations with TDDs so we can have access to weather reports.

We have two specific points here. The building code, such as that for hotels, needs to have TDDs installed, as well as closed-captioning devices, as well as alarm systems

that are visible to deaf people, such as flashing lights, in the event of a fire, while staying in hotels.

As well, we need to have some kind of visual representation of any noise that demonstrates someone at the door or a message or whatever access is provided to the hearing people. We need this in a visual form. As well, general hospitals need to have the flashing alarm system for emergencies, as well as closed-captioning or something. Whereas hearing people are able to provide information to each other on what the exact emergency is, this needs to be represented in a visual form, be it a print readout or what have you. Also, for deaf people who are in the hospital, they need to have some kind of closed captioning so that information can be provided to them and they have access to it.

Recently I have moved into a new apartment. In my negotiations with the landlord, I mentioned that the flashing doorbell needed to be installed or a peephole, so I know who is at the door. In our negotiations the landlord's response was, "Well, I'm sorry, this is something you're going to have to incur the expense for." When I mentioned that to him, he said, "Well, it does have a safety latch on it," but I need the visual form in a flashing light to know that someone is at the door. I do not like having to have the safety latch on, to open it only a certain distance to try to recognize who is there. In even trying to get this peephole, I was denied. Also, if I do have to move, any installation I have paid to have put in I have to leave.

When we move on to the deaf community, as I have talked with some other members of the community, we have noticed that other disabled people have access to workshops or in providing information to the public, yet, for deaf people, we are not allowed to provide this kind of public education. Seventy-five per cent have brought up the issue of TDDs, and I have congratulated them on this, yet we still are lacking access to closed captioning. When you look at business, people do advertising and we think they need to have access with closed captioning for us.

Also, we would like to suggest that deaf people, as well as those who are not deaf, develop common relationships in the community and, please, have respect for us and we need you to just listen to us. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

BETTY SMITH

The Chair: The next, and final, speaker, is Betty Smith.

Ms Smith: Like the last few speakers, I had not heard about this until this afternoon, so I have put some notes together as I arrived. I do believe I bring a different perspective from some of the ones that have been presented here, so I welcome the chance to share some of my thoughts with you.

1800

I am very proud to be a Canadian, but throughout my life I have been frustrated by the fact that I do not believe as a country we have ever reached our potential. I believe part of that has to do with our complacency, the fact that we have had so much going for us and the apathy has been present. Unlike a previous speaker, I think this is a golden

opportunity to do something differently and to really bring about some significant change in this country, particularly because more people are, in my language, emotionally hooked by the issue. This is the time when we have some potentially creative energy which we can focus and turn to dealing with the very gutsy, crunchy issue we have, which involves, in my opinion, major revision of the Constitution. I was one who was initially upset that Meech Lake did not pass, but now I am very grateful that it did not pass because it was just tinkering with the Constitution, in my opinion.

I speak as someone who grew up in Winnipeg, grew up in the west, and learned what it was like to be helpless and powerless in the national scheme. I do not carry any anger around, but that is a reality that I want to make sure people in Ontario understand. Ontario has been my home for many years, my home of choice. It has been good to me. I like it. Toronto originally, Collingwood recently. I also had the opportunity to work in Montreal, at least to get my education in Montreal, so I lived with the French Canadians both in Montreal and in the hills around Montreal and had a chance to get to know that culture and something about it.

I have also had the chance from 1976 through 1987 to build a national organization which was known as the Trust Companies Institute. There were 26,000 people with 44 different companies from right across the country, with head offices from Victoria to St John's, Newfoundland. And we lived with diversity and we built on diversity and out of it came real strength.

I think one of our major problems as Canadians is that we have not realized a major, critical resource right on our doorstep, and that is different from some of the opinions I have heard expressed here today. Toronto, we know, is the most multicultural city in the world. It is a microcosm of the global village where we as Canadians have an opportunity to get to learn something, really learn how we can build on this diversity rather than walk away from it. Homogeneity is really very dull. I find dealing with different opinions and different points of view and different cultures awkward and kind of threatening, but when I expose myself to that I find the richness of that experience is overpowering. I have a dream, and my dream is that we in this country, particularly close to the Metropolitan Toronto area, will take on the task of trying to learn how to appreciate those differences, respect those differences, and then I believe we could really become the potential country in the world which many of us have dreamed about. We could share with some of the other neighbours we have—or they will become neighbours very soon in the global village.

How are the various countries going to get along across the world? I have had the opportunity to travel in the Soviet Union, so I have some ideas there too. But what I would like to say in terms of the Canadian situation is that I believe we need a constitutional conference. I believe what we want, what we did in the Trust Companies Institute which I built, was to have national standards with tremendous freedom for people to achieve those standards as they chose. Our role as a national organization was to provide resources, provide consultation, to share experiences across the country and give people the opportunity to learn from one another if they chose to learn from one another, as long as they met the national standards and the national requirements. That was the only restriction. I think much of what we learned and much of that thinking has application on the Canadian scene, whether we end up with 10 regions, whether we end up with 11 provinces, five regions and some kind of central government.

One of the points I would like to make before closing is that one of the things we frequently say is that we need a strong central government. I agree with that, but my definition of a strong central government is different from the one we generally envision. As far as I am concerned, when we think of a strong central government we think of what we have known in the organizations in which we have all grown up, that is, the schools, the churches and most anything else you can name in our society. The organizational forum is not unlike the dictatorship in the way it operates. We have said we want that kind of central control, yet when we experience it we do not like it; we find it does not meet our needs and we find it does not work.

A government, in my opinion, can be very strong by providing a vision, by exercising leadership, by encouraging people to really work through their differences, by providing them with resources and by helping to work out those differences and sharing that information across the country. In other words, be catalytic leaders, the kind our modern organizations, the ones that are going to survive in this global world, are finding they have to move towards: team leadership, partnership and consensus-building, name it what you will. I think if we as Canadians could begin to go down that road we would get very energized, very excited and be able to find a place. I hope we will, at least before I leave this one. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much. With that presentation, we will conclude our afternoon session here in Collingwood. We will now recess for an hour until 7 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 1807.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1922.

The Chair: I will call the meeting to order while Mr Beer finishes the distribution of the chocolates that we received earlier today from one of the presenters. Let me welcome those of you who are here. This is of course the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are resuming our hearings here in Collingwood this evening. We had a hearing earlier today. We had a number of people speak to us and we have a number of people on the list this evening.

I should take a minute at the beginning to wish everyone happy Valentine's, not only the people who are here but people across the province, and I guess our own families of the members of the committee, who may or may not be pleased with our being here as opposed to being home this evening.

Be that as it may, today also happens to be another occasion, which is Equality Eve. One of our members, Ms Churley, is going to say a couple of words about that.

Ms Churley: Thank you, Mr Chair. I do not know if everybody here is aware of what Equality Eve means, but 10 years ago today 1,400 women converged on Ottawa to form the, I think by now, infamous ad hoc conference on women in the Constitution after they had had an official meeting with the then government cancelled because the government thought these women coming might embarrass it. The women decided to take a chance and have an informal meeting anyway and were quite surprised and gratified when about 1,400 women showed up. They continued to lobby successfully in getting equality for women enshrined in the Charter of Rights.

Tonight, thousands of women are meeting again in dinner parties all across the country to celebrate the 10th anniversary of this victory for women. I was invited to some of those dinner parties in Toronto and I am very sorry that I am not there tonight. But I am also at the same time happy to be here at least doing something that I think is important and a continuation of the work that began for women 10 years ago, and for all us, because it is a funny coincidence actually, in a way, that it is Valentine's Day and we are here talking about the Constitution.

So I just want to wish, on behalf of all of us, the women who are of course watching us on television right now while they are eating dinner together, a happy Valentine's Day and I hope they will continue the discussions on the Constitution and how women will continue to have a role, and hopefully a much greater role than in the past.

To end, I would just like to say that the latest report worked on by the National Action Committee on the Status of Women has been very disheartening. I do not know if people saw it in the paper today, but the reality is that in many ways women's lives are getting harder. As the poor are getting poorer, the findings are that women's lives are getting harder. So it is clear that we have a lot of work to do, and I encourage women to come out and speak to us as we continue to cross this province, because we would really

like to hear your views on how we can make sure that you are involved throughout this process.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Churley.

Could I just say to the people who are on the list to speak to us this evening, because we have a number of other people who have indicated an interest to speak to us, we would appreciate it if we could have the presentations by individuals limited to 10 minutes and those by organizations or groups limited to 20 minutes. That would allow us to be able to add a bit of time to deal with the additional speakers.

ELROY BELBECK

The Chair: With that, let me call Elroy Belbeck to come forward.

Mr Belbeck: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I was allotted 15 minutes in my agreement so I am afraid I am going to have to stick to that, but I will try not to go over.

The Chair: We would appreciate it if you could trim it down, sir. We realize that you were given the 15 minutes, but as I say we are trying to accommodate other people as well.

Mr Belbeck: I have chosen to read my comments as a means of keeping within my time limit. Mr Rae claims that your committee has been created by elected representatives who want you to operate in a spirit of openness and participation. He says that it is time to rise above partisan interests. That sounds good. Whether it is an exercise in window dressing by politicians who will return to their caucuses behind closed doors and ignore the wishes of the majority remains to be seen.

Thank you for the opportunity to address some major issues at a crucial time, when resentment against government policies from Ottawa and from Toronto are running high and when about 20% of government funds in Ontario and around one third of the federal government income goes to pay interest on provincial or national debt.

Under "Canada at the Crossroads," page 4, your discussion paper states that "We need a consensus on issues...also on values." True. "Governments in free, diverse and democratic societies need to return to the people for guidance." That last word in the last paragraph should be "decisions." Governments need to turn to the people for decisions. Please allow me to explain with reference to the Canadian Constitution, as I will in a moment.

When David Peterson decided to kowtow to Mr Bourassa and the Quebec politicians in Ottawa by supporting the Meech Lake deal and by insulting the vast majority of Ontarians by imposing Bill 8 upon us, he did so not in response to the wishes of the people of Ontario but in spite of them.

Mulroney and Peterson have demonstrated themselves to be the kind of dictators that have too often wielded power over us, carrying on discussions, making decisions behind closed doors, with no reference to the wishes of the majority. We all know what happened to Meech and to

Peterson, thanks to Elijah Harper, Clyde Wells and the Ontario voters.

The development of representative government in the English-speaking world was rooted in the British practice of the maximum decentralization of power, with checks and balances, and the individual's rights guaranteed by the English common law, which was a reflection of the traditional Christian view of the uniqueness and value of every individual.

But now we have become perverted by the highly regimented party system to the point where voters are told that they have given the go-ahead to the successful party to impose unwanted policies. When frustrated voters reluctantly say they are voting for the least of a number of evils or do not vote at all, they are helping to tighten further the shackles of tyranny. Putting a mark on a piece of paper does not ensure democracy. People of Lithuania and of the Soviet Union vote, but that does not mean they are able to control their rulers.

The traditional system of representative democracy has broken down. Centralized government bureaucracies wielding power through their own regulations undermine responsible government. We have ended up with an elected dictatorship, elections, polls and panels notwithstanding.

I shall attempt to deal briefly with each of the questions for discussion.

1. "What are the values we share as Canadians?" We cherish our heritage of freedom drawn up by the Fathers of Confederation in 1867.

We take pride in being able to welcome people of diverse origins and languages, given that we can encourage them to learn English and become self-sufficient as soon as possible and also to maintain their culture and language and religion, but in their own associations and at their own expense.

1930

We have the privilege of developing and protecting our beautiful and diverse environment and resources, even though we must now fight against government intrusion into private property rights, either by omitting them from the despicable Charter of Rights and Freedoms or by plundering them through agencies such as the Niagara Escarpment Commission.

Can we build bridges between our views as Ontario residents and those of other regions? Yes, except for Quebec. I shall address this later. Do we pay too little attention to what we have in common? Yes, especially to our heritage of freedom that we had under the British North America Act and the common law.

The Fathers of Confederation, meeting in 1867, stated clearly that they wanted to be federally united with a Constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom, not a written Constitution. Under the British North America Act, every citizen is free to do anything that is not prohibited by the ordinary law of the land, the common law, which was an evolving framework of social order, and everyone, high or low, was subject to it. Individual freedom was an inherent right.

Now, under Pierre Trudeau's Charter of Rights and Freedoms, modelled after the written constitution of France, individual freedom is considered not an inherent right but a privilege conferred upon citizens by the state. We have slipped from having freedom as our birthright to having it conferred by the state, which may therefore impose limitations on our freedom or withdraw it altogether. In the English system, Parliament was supreme; now, under the French system, the written charter is controlled by unelected judges.

We have deteriorated from a society that once was composed of law-abiding people taking personal responsibility for their actions to a collection of people taught that we have charter rights to claim against others. We have slipped from a people ruled by an elected Parliament to a country ruled by appointed judges. Thus we have moved from the English system of having government power reside in the people, to the French model in which power and our cultural choices are exercised and controlled by élites, people not elected.

There are clear indications of the contempt that the Ottawa-Hull and Toronto governments have for the widely expressed desire of citizens. Some examples:

Open-door immigration at the same time as widespread recession, unemployment and the destruction of our native-born citizens at the rate in Canada of over 200 a day by abortion;

Abolishing and refusing to reinstate capital punishment for the crime of premeditated murder;

Continuing application of the ridiculous Young Offenders Act in spite of the epidemic of robberies and armed plundering by youth gangs in places like Toronto;

Financing United Nations projects, including dishing out our tax dollars to various Third World Marxists, dictators and terrorists;

Imposing compulsory bilingualism in every province at great cost to the taxpayers and with very unfair treatment of those who are not fluent in French—for example, this discussion booklet, published by our Ontario government for a population of which fewer than 1% of the French citizens cannot speak English; you could mail the English portion for 86 cents, but the whole book would cost \$1.38 to mail, including GST;

Imposing unwanted measures in contempt of the wishes of the majority of the people: immigration powers to Quebec, GST, removal of government offices to "punish" places like Sault Ste Marie that chose to declare themselves English only, when even the French Canadian mayor of Petrolia declared, and I heard him personally, on TV, "Why should we go to the expense of publishing things in a language that we are not using?";

Manipulation of education for political and social change, excluding British history, grammar, phonetics and spelling to a great extent, while promoting a secular humanist philosophy including sexual perversion under the guise of fighting AIDS.

2. "How can we secure our future in the international economy?" That is the next question asked. We should withdraw from the United Nations, honour our friends and pay off our huge international debts. The day that the new

United States of Europe dictates our policies, we are finished as an independent state.

We have unrealistically high economic goals, considering our provincial and national debt and our small population. Our goods and services in some industries have been priced beyond what the world market will bear.

Hundreds of thousands of acres of farm land in Ontario are idle. Farmers have been unable to obtain capital at sensible interest rates, property rights are being invaded and control of food production is heading for control by corporations and government. What is the answer? Stop spending money on programs foisted on the people, such as bilingualism, metrification, park land schemes and needless bureaucracies. Devote the money saved to funding at reasonable rates on long-term loans for small industry and farming.

3. "What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?" There are matters such as defence, immigration, international affairs and the payment of its debt to foreigners that should be handled by the federal government.

Among the things that provincial governments can handle are education, health and social assistance. Tax dollars for education should follow children to the school of the parents' choice. Payments for health and social assistance should be made only to those who can prove need.

By restructuring provincial boundaries, the territories could be allotted to the provinces. Postal service would operate better in private hands, and the reduced federal jurisdiction and responsibility would lower its share of taxes.

4. "How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal peoples?" There is no quick solution. I conferred this week with a Blackfoot friend, Gayesdweena Bitoch-Guyou-Samee, and he pointed out that the problem started when the defeated native peoples were not absorbed, given full citizen rights and privileges and expected to be responsible. Special rights of property and tax-free status should not have been granted.

As things stand, we should proceed to wipe out the crippling and unfair reservation system. A very few aboriginals, who have become wealthy at the expense of their own people, would be very angry, but that would pass. From then on, we should honour and respect them as we would any other Canadian.

5. "What are the roles of the English and French languages in Canada?" The present Official Languages Act is costly and unnecessary and destructive of the purposes intended for us by the Fathers of Confederation in 1867. Callers to government departments are answered by bilingual receptionists and often in French first. This discussion booklet was printed in both languages for use across Ontario. Copies in French could have been provided for those who required them. This is an example of how money could be saved.

Abolish Bill 8. The Swiss example would be helpful. This is very interesting for us. In 1874, they were at an impasse as bad as ours, or worse. German, French and Italian groups were vying for first place. By common consent, they set up a constitutional system which gives the people freedom to initiate legislation, to veto undesired

proposed legislation by referendum and to recall an MP who is not performing satisfactorily. Let's try it.

6. "What is Quebec's future in Canada?" The majority of the people in Quebec want French only. They now control their own immigration, have their own legal code, their own pension plan and levy their own income tax. They are in effect a separate nation already, except for the English-speaking minority, which has been ignored. Let Quebec become a separate nation, with no farewell party, no concessions, no hard feelings. The sooner it happens, the better.

7. "What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region?" There should be full co-operation among all regions, with special favours to none.

8. "What does Ontario want?" Your paper says that we are getting more numerous. Good. We need more people. We are an empty land compared with the Netherlands or Israel. Stop abortion, restrict the federal government to its proper roles, reward the producers of food and basic needs, restore property rights and respect them—then watch Ontario grow.

Since a lot of our population is in cities, a bigger share of revenues should go to city governments and less for things like Peterson's permanent \$61,000 pension and the implementation of his infamous Bill 8.

It is not encouraging to see on page 23 of the discussion paper that the time is short; that is, for the study. It is encouraging to see that your government understands that solutions to our problems cannot be left to politicians alone. Note that we do not want decisions made by non-elected bureaucrats and judges.

Move to promote the election of senators, the same number for every province. Demand that judges be elected, not appointed. We want to see an end to policies that demonstrate that all languages and people are to be treated equally, except French. Most people of French descent in Ontario speak English and are willing to be part of a representative democracy. It is the politicians, particularly those who depend on Quebec for power, who have created most of our problems in the matters of language and special privileges for French, not the French people themselves. And please remind Mr. Rae that we do want a referendum on all major proposed policies and changes.

Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. I can appreciate your attempt to be brief.

1940

HARRY RICHARDSON

The Chair: We will move on. Harry Richardson. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Richardson: Mr Chairman, members of the panel, I think really we could all spend a lot more time with the previous speaker exploring some of the ideas that he offered. I am going to be much briefer. The main point of my presentation is that in looking at Ontario, as I think the mandate of this group was, my view is that you cannot separate Ontario from the rest of Canada or you cannot put it into pockets and deal with it that way.

You will find in looking at the material that I have to present to you that I have looked at it in a totality, and beginning with that, it is my view that we have too much government. Given a population of 26 million people, roughly the same population as the state of California, we have villages, towns, municipalities, counties, regional governments, provincial governments, federal of course, all with committees. When you consider what it costs us in Canada to maintain government, I think that for the size of our population, we should certainly reconsider the whole structure.

I was reading in a magazine that a Conservative MP from Quebec, Pierrette Venne, came up with a suggestion of five, in her language, autonomous regions. I am not so sure that we would want to necessarily head for the same kind of autonomy. But looking at boundaries and considering that geographically Canada, even as late as 1949, had a change in boundaries and that over the course of the 100 years that we are looking back, the 100 or so years in our history, our boundaries have been changing constantly, I think if we take a look at it from a geographic standpoint, it would be reasonable to assume that British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, with a combined population of roughly seven million, would make one geographic unit. If you take a look at Ontario, with about eight million people, again you have got a geographic unit. You have got a geographic unit in Quebec of about six million people, and the Maritimes, of course, would need to be considered as one unit of slightly over two million.

But given that, we have got an estrangement in the country. We have got westerners saying that the easterners are getting the best advantage. We have got people from the Maritimes who say that they do not feel right about Confederation. So I think, in looking at government stretched across the country and where we have been trying to please sections of the country through government, that if we put it together in larger groups, we could, one, bring the cost down and, two, give a much better representation on the country as a whole.

I would not want to overlook the Northwest Territories, Keewatin and so on. Perhaps if the boundaries, the 60th parallel—there is nothing sacred that I am aware of about that geographic area—if the Northwest Territories' boundaries were brought down a little further into southern Canada, maybe they would feel more at home as well.

In looking at the cost of government—I have got as a second item in there a thought of mine; I was not prepared to make a presentation to a group like this on television—I had a thought that we spend about six months of the year, I understand, earning an income so that we can pay our taxes. And banged on the first point that we have got too much government, maybe that is why the taxes are high. But if we could cut that cost by even 10%, that is, about 18 days' salary, it puts a lot more spending money back in an individual's pockets.

Just as an example of that, when you think of the 10 governments that we have, I ask you seriously, do we really need 10 Lieutenant Governors plus a Governor General? Do they have a function in the 21st century that we are heading into, when communication and transportation are

far different than they were when our boundaries were drawn up?

Looking at a form of government, again this was national:

1. Two Houses, Commons and Senate, both elected.
2. Elected members, responsible to their ridings, could be removed under certain circumstances. I believe the previous speaker alluded to that type of a point.
3. Referendum required on matters that substantially alter the status quo.
4. Regional meetings mandatory with elected representatives, town hall type, something along this order where it is a dialogue both ways. I assume that your function tonight is to listen. Hopefully, if this idea were to generate further, it would be a two-way means of communication so that the electorate would have a much more informed basis on which to decide and to help government decide on issues.
5. Develop means whereby the public become participants in government. The Swiss style here might be a reasonable model, and of course the federal government would represent in all international affairs.
6. Internally—and I have not taken them as exhaustive at all—but it seems to me in looking at Canada, we have 10 different education systems that produce 10 different results. We are coming into an area where we are highly technical, highly competitive, yet our education systems across the country are not giving us this kind of results. I would suggest that this be put under one administrative group to produce the kind of results that a growing and industrial country such as Canada needs.

The same thing in health: whether it can be argued as a provincial right or not, I think we as Canadians look at it as a Canadian right, put it strongly in the vestage of a national government. Family benefits is another example, and taxation, under one system. It is a shame to me that some provinces have sales taxes as high as 12%, plus this goods and services business bringing their cost seen at the counter of goods as high as that, whereas other provinces have had no sales tax and govern on a much different basis. I think we need to look at much more equity that way.

Looking lastly at Quebec, this question has been with us for decades. It is not likely to go away easily, as long as the political balance of power appears to rest with the province of Quebec. The province, as we all know, does not represent a majority of the national population or wealth, and things of that sort. It is one geographical location interdependent on the rest of Canada for its present state. Should the people of that province, for any reason or by any means, decide on independence, secession or whatever, it should be understood beforehand that such separation would be total.

Some thoughts to ponder here are that: they create their own monetary system; they assume for repayment a portion of the national debt; their boundaries be as they were in 1867; (d) all interprovincial agreements be renegotiated—that would give Newfoundland another whack at the power deal that they felt quite badly about; all loans, grants, etc, outstanding to business, government of the old

province, be called; and the French-speaking people outside of the new country enjoy the rights of the English-speaking majority.

These are some of the kinds of things that I think we need to get up front and say: "If you decide that you are going to leave this country, which has been good to you, you should know that there are some conditions attached to it. It isn't simply a matter of walking out the door with all of the goods and whatever you had accumulated in the meantime."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the extent of my brief to you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Richardson.

OWEN SOUND AND DISTRICT LABOUR COUNCIL

The Chair: I call Greg Cooper next, on behalf of the Owen Sound and District Labour Council.

Mr Cooper: Mr Chairman, members of the panel, my name is Greg Cooper and I am president of the Owen Sound and District Labour Council. I want to thank you for this opportunity to speak with you on this constitutional crisis that we face, while we have had to stand by helplessly while our future and that of our children is being sold out from under us, with job loss to free trade, the use of our troops against our own people in Oka and the first-ever made-in-Canada recession.

The problems we face in this country run much deeper than the failure of Meech Lake. Our problems are complex, and another attempt at the Constitution that only addresses part of the problem will leave our nation divided. We need a Constitution that protects all of our basic rights. It must make our country strong and, above all, economically independent. We must control our own economy to be strong: educational equality, equality for women, equality for our first nations, equality of basic affordable health care, equality in our tax system.

Further, where does our constitutional right to be gainfully employed lie? Canadians who are less fortunate should be able to live above the poverty line in dignity. All of these rights should be the most basic under the Constitution as well as educational rights. We are seeing the trickle-down effect of years of irresponsible government which does not keep the people's best interests at heart. Our social programs, once the envy of the world, have undergone drastic cuts. Now less fortunate Canadians must live below the poverty line, and some are without the basic shelter they and their families need.

1950

All this before the cost of the Gulf war is assessed. How many more cuts do we face? Our Prime Minister talked of rebuilding the Middle East after the war. I bring to you a message in the strongest possible manner that it is Canada and the pride and morale of our working people that needs to be rebuilt. This cannot be done by selling our jobs to Mexico for \$3.28 a day.

In Canada our workers have to buy their jobs with government grants and subsidies paid for by our own tax dollars. How ironic to see these jobs cross the border, laughing all the way. Canadian workers and their families

should have the constitutional right to be employed gainfully. If our jobs are protected, then our economy and our future is safe. If jobs are lost, then we should have the right to retraining. Where is the training we were promised in the trade deal? We must have the constitutional right to have labour with equal representation on the boards that allocate the retraining funds, and not one cent of this money should go anywhere except to displaced workers and their families. They all should get equal treatment regardless of age group.

Do not ever confuse these presentations with consultation; they are not. Consultation can only come with equal representation at the decision-making process. Where is our right to a national health and safety policy for the Canadian workplace? Canadian workers are still exposed to unsafe conditions, and in the fight to keep our jobs safe from an unfair trade deal, we will see conditions get worse. All this in the name of competition and production. Where also is our right to fair compensation for workplace accidents?

The problem of poverty in this country should sicken us all. It is one thing to say that you know their plight, but it is another to show the leadership and foresight to build a Constitution that ensures their dignity. It must ensure that our less fortunate and their families can live in dignity and not in the streets. It must help them to become productive members of the workforce. These people, through no fault of their own, are down on their luck.

Women's rights too must be addressed. If the new Constitution is to be considered complete, women must be treated with equality. They are valuable, productive people of our community.

First nation rights must be in the new Constitution. To further ignore their needs is one of the biggest oversights this country has ever seen. We must settle outstanding land claims swiftly and fairly, seeing that our nation within a nation is treated again with dignity, not with the contempt showed by the Quebec and Canadian governments. The solution of force does not solve the problem.

All Canadians should have the constitutional right to good, affordable health care. Transfer payments being cut by the federal government worsens an underfunded system. We must never let our system fall to one equal to a US system, where only the well-off get health care. Our senior citizens and our children must be protected.

The basic right to an equal education system should be in the new Constitution. Making this commitment to our children secures our future for generations to come. Again, we have seen transfer payments cut, hurting our educational system and our youth.

Our Constitution should secure our environment. Why do we have to phase in controls with vague and indistinct legislation such as the green paper? It must be an economic right to have a clean environment.

Finally, we need a constitutional right to a fair tax system. The current system treats us, the working people, the same as the wealthy. This kind of equality is not what this country needs. We need to generate more revenue from sources that can afford it. As the government policies force unemployment through the roof, who will pay the taxes then? A

new and fair tax system with no GST should be a constitutional right.

In conclusion, let me say that my theme has obviously been dignity and quality of life. Equality does not build pedestals; it tears them down. Let me again caution you, do not confuse these presentations with consultation; they are not. Consultation can only come through equal representation. A complete Constitution will ensure our economy and our future. Meech Lake failed because it was incomplete. We must not let this country be hijacked or held for ransom. We must build a Constitution that works and keeps Canadians working. Then, with glowing hearts, we will see a true north strong and free.

Thank you for your time.

Mr Offer: Mr Cooper, thank you very much for your presentation. You have comprehensively gone through and listed a number of not only values but issues, and how they can be addressed. I think this type of presentation will be very helpful to the committee in our deliberation as we move into our second stage. So, first, I thank you for that.

On the basis of your presentation, so much of it was directed, if I might say, on an economic bent. If you could briefly maybe share with the committee some of the economic conditions in this area, I think that would be helpful to us. You might be able to share some of your views and thoughts on what is happening in Collingwood at this time.

Mr Cooper: You do not have to look any farther than Collingwood to see the effects of free trade. No matter how much employers choose to deny it, there is no denying the fact that when Harding Carpets first moved out—it was a profitable organization that made money here for years—they moved somewhere where they thought they could make more. It was not the case of losing money in Collingwood. I think the same can be said for almost all companies that are closing down with a marginal few exceptions.

We are seeing the same effects now in Owen Sound and all around this district. My personal plant is closing down. They will not admit it. They have got everybody on temporary layoffs right now. Unfortunately, that is not against the law. He can do that; however, we all know what his outright intentions are. Certainly it is ironic that this committee would meet in Collingwood with as many problems as Collingwood has. The attention that is being given to Collingwood right now is well deserved.

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for sharing that with us, and once more thank you for your presentation, and certainly your views on the impact that you say the free trade agreement has had on this particular area.

Mr Harnick: I would like to reiterate what Mr Offer said. Your brief contained all or certainly many of the elements that should be in a new Constitution. You referred throughout your brief to standards of health care, standards of education and standards of quality of life. What I would like to know is, in the new Constitution that you would like to see, who would be responsible for setting those standards, and should those standards be set in a way that would provide equality from one province to another?

Mr Cooper: Exactly. When we are dealing with a Constitution, of course, we are dealing with the basic Charter of Rights and Freedoms that all Canadians should enjoy equally. I think we can stress that, especially since through the economic system that we now have, the educational rights of our first nation peoples are not being completely recognized. They are not having the equal right to opportunity to education at a post-secondary level that others do. As well as other economically depressed provinces, I think this would help bring them to a standard. As I said, the new Constitution should not build pedestals for anyone; it should take the pedestals that now exist and knock them down.

Mr Harnick: Are you saying you believe that the federal government, the central government, should be setting those standards?

Mr Cooper: Unless we want 10 different constitutions in Canada, I would say that would have to be the way it is.

Mr Waters: In your brief you talked quite a bit about the economic impact on the area and how you felt it is affecting that. Most of the groups that have talked to us have talked about basically changing the boundaries in Canada and whether Quebec should stay in or go. I was wondering if you had any feelings on that.

Mr Cooper: I try not to have feelings about whether Quebec should go or stay because I do not think I would like to get involved in Quebec-bashing. I would like to see Canada remain strong. I would like to see all Canadians treated equally. I would like to see the pedestals that now exist, and certainly Meech Lake was a pedestal. Let's just say I did not lose any sleep over its failure.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Cooper. I think that is the end of the questions we have. Thank you very much for your presentation.

2000

DAVE AND DEBBIE KILPATRICK

The Chair: Dave Kilpatrick and Debbie Kilpatrick.

Mrs Kilpatrick: Because we are short of time I will go through my brief, because it is basically expressing the feelings of both of us.

I would like, first of all, to thank the committee and the Chairman for allowing us this time. Because we did not receive any information on this, I just did this in a topic-issue thing, in no particular order of importance.

On Quebec issues: Quebec is a distinct society. We have no argument with this. Quebec, however, is a province in Canada and they deserve no rights or powers over any other province—special rights, that is. It is time to stop catering to and spending on one minority. Even after years of the governments' efforts, they still do not want to be part of Canada. We feel Quebec should not be allowed to tear this country apart. If Quebec does not want the role of a working province, then maybe we should look at east coast provinces annexing them. This could possibly bring greater prosperity to a region of Canada that relies heavily on unemployment insurance and welfare benefits.

Time and time again, our government shows no direction or leadership concerning the language issue. Provinces, regions and citizens of Canada are forced at a great expense to this country to accept French as an official language, while at the same time, Quebec is allowed to freely prohibit and restrict the usage of our other official language, English. It may work better if Canadians could vote on this same issue at federal and provincial levels, as well as at regional levels. Only in this way do we believe that the French language will be accepted by all Canadians. Making French an option in our schools exemplifies the right of choice in this issue.

The issue of free trade: We believe Canadians should have been allowed to vote on this issue. This was something of great importance to every single Canadian citizen and for Canada as a country. Our Prime Minister took our rights away and forced free trade through. Those who benefited most were large companies to make larger profits. For the hardships he has caused to the Canadian people and the destruction of our country in his uncaring manner of handling of the free trade agreement, Prime Minister Mulroney should be asked to resign.

The issue of goods and services tax: This extra strain on Canadian purses should be collected and paid directly to the deficit. There should be no rebates to anyone and there should be no exemptions to anyone except low-income Canadians. When this debt is paid, then this unfair tax should be eliminated.

Native issues: Oka and the situation in Iraq prove once more the mismanagement of our government. How can they justify sending our young men and women to war in Iraq to defend the borders and rights of those, because negotiations seemingly failed, while in Oka just this past summer our native Canadians who had been negotiating for their land claims and rights had the army turned upon them? They were called criminals for defending what they believed in. We support our troops 100% for what they are doing in the Gulf and feel very proud of them. At the same time, we feel ashamed for the mistreatment and neglect given to our founding people.

We believe it is time to let an independent handle these claims. It is obvious that as long as it is left to the government it will never be completely or fairly settled. Until then, Canadians will bear this shame.

Government responsibility: Our government has a responsibility to represent and to protect each and every Canadian. During Meech Lake, our elected Prime Minister chose not to do this. He also chose tactics that were criminal; any ordinary citizen doing the same thing would have been charged with blackmail. Though his actions on this matter were disgusting, some good did come from this. We learned that there is a chance that there are politicians in Canada who really care what Canadians think. Clyde Wells left us that glimmer of hope. He stood up, under the most degrading pressure put upon one man, in front of a whole nation and fought for what he thought the majority of Canadians believed in too.

As for other politicians who mislead Canadians, mismanage Canadian tax dollars, who are found to be corrupt

and deceitful, they must be accountable for their actions. It is not enough to merely have them resign.

Our Prime Minister is guilty of causing a division between our people that may take generations to heal. He has taken it upon himself to ignore the wishes of the majority of Canadians on every important issue in this country. His decisions have had and will have a negative effect on Canadians and the future of this country for generations. We feel Mr Mulroney has sold the Canadians and our country and will continue to do so as long as he is in power. He shows no remorse in destroying a country that was so prosperous and had such a wonderful future. For these reasons, which we see as crimes against Canada, we believe Mr Mulroney should be charged with treason.

My final remarks: We as Canadians, who have always been proud to say so, now feel ashamed. We have lost all faith and all hope of any future for our children. We feel fear and frustration because we see our country disintegrating before our eyes and feel helpless to stop what is happening. We feel government has been bought and paid for by big businesses. They do not carry the burden of heavy taxes, and now those savings are buying jobs for the Americans and possibly the Mexican people.

There is something terribly wrong when our government is allowed by virtue of its own power to continue such destruction. When our courts allow criminals to go free, when big business and unions have more power than our government and when profit-making is more important than our children's education and our country, we have a problem. Before we can mend our Constitution, it would be wise to mend our country. Thank you.

Mr Beer: I think what I really wanted was just to try to meet you and your husband as other human beings who happen at this point in time to be elected members of a provincial Legislature. I do not think anybody could listen to you without feeling a very deep sense of alienation from our democratic institutions. I think all of us who are elected have families. We come from communities, like you, which were not perfect, but somehow the goals we seek, as you would seek for yourselves, for your children, for the future of the country, are things we seek, and it is a democratic system. It is an imperfect system. Many things happen that we might not like, yet we struggle, we try to come to grips with those issues.

Without saying that I necessarily agree with every point you make, one of the things that has struck us as members of this committee is that sense of feeling cut off from what is happening, feeling cut off from having power over a lot of what is going on. We are hearing that and I hope we can, in our way, try to bring that to play on the kinds of things the Ontario government would do. I just felt it important to say that to you.

2010

As imperfect, as I say, as our system is, I think it is critically important that people feel free to be able to come forward and to express those views and those concerns, because otherwise we ain't going to make it. As you say at the end of your presentation, I think before we can mend our Constitution it would be wise to mend our country. In

a sense what we are all going through in many different parts of this country right now, in terms of committees like this and so on, is to try to listen and to find again a sense of consensus that can bring us all together from whatever region.

I leave that with you. As I say, I hope we have heard what you have said. While you may not always agree with anything governments or individual elected members do, we are trying in our own way to deal with the concerns you have raised, as intelligently and compassionately as we can.

Mrs Kilpatrick: I appreciate that you got my message, because I think you did get my message clearly. For all of Canada's sake—besides being a mother and an owner of a small business—I hope you can do something with the message I am trying to get through, for the sake of all of Canada.

The Chair: Mr Kilpatrick, you wanted to say something?

Mr Kilpatrick: How are we doing for time?

The Chair: We are beyond the time, but if you would like to make a couple of comments—

Mr Kilpatrick: The Constitution. Everybody is talking about separation. You go to somebody's house and you are across the table. I ask them, "What do you think of the Constitution?" They say, "Let them go, let them do what they want to do," but that is wrong. Quebec is part of Canada, it should stay part of Canada. We need leadership in our government, somebody to stand up there and say, "Listen, this is the way it's going to be." Anybody else talks separation, they should be kicked out of government. Start the bells ringing by a kick in the pants.

Mrs Kilpatrick: When you talked about people being able to come forward, I would like to point out that there is something happening. With the Oka crisis, for example, I put a sign on my front yard in support of our natives, and I had family and friends who were actually afraid of what might happen to me, maybe by politicians, for doing that. Friends and family and other people we spoke with who have small businesses in our community, again, when they found out what we were going to discuss here this evening, people actually said to me, "Aren't you afraid that you might just disappear six months down the road?" More than one person in the last few days brought this fear that I would be somehow punished in one way or another. I found that rather frightening. There is something stirring underneath that people do not realize is happening in this country. I think it has something to do with government and the type of power and the way it is using it, that Canadians, in a country like this, are actually afraid to give their honest opinion on something.

The Chair: I think it should trouble all of us that those feelings exist.

Mrs Kilpatrick: I would hope so.

The Chair: If there is one thing we have sensed and heard very clearly in the different places we have been in the last two weeks it is that there is a real cry for more serious ways to involve the general public, the people of

the province, in the whole decision-making process, and that there is a great deal of cynicism and scepticism about the political process. We are hearing very clearly that we need to try to do something about it.

Mrs Kilpatrick: I think that is the only way our country is going to work, if we all work together—citizens, big business, small business, just everybody as a people. But it is frightening if people are going to be afraid to come forward and try to do that. Maybe this panel could, six months down the road, check back and make sure there were no repercussions for anybody who sat before this committee. I find it rather frightening that in just a little area, of a few friends and business people I spoke with in the last few days, this came up so many times; and six months ago, when I put a sign on my front yard, I had the same reaction, "Aren't you afraid of doing this?" I find that frightening.

Mr Beer: Do not ever be afraid to speak your mind.

Mrs Kilpatrick: I am not.

Mr Beer: Clearly.

Mrs Kilpatrick: That is what is so wonderful about Canada, that we still are hopefully a free nation and never have to be afraid, but I find it frightening that other Canadians do not feel that way, and I wonder why.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

NORMAN SEABROOK

The Chair: I call Norman Seabrook.

Mr Seabrook: I will be very brief. I did not have any opportunity to study your material; I did not realize this opportunity would be open to me until yesterday forenoon. So I apologize for my script and my very brief presentation, but I hope that by being brief the points I make will be better received. I do not intend to get into any lengthy detail on anything, but there are a few key issues that I feel are very important, certainly to me, and I will touch on those. I think I will just read my brief and maybe elaborate a little at the end.

I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to present my thoughts and concerns on the role Ontario should play in formulating Canada's future. Being the home of Canada's largest English-speaking population, it is proper that this province represent that majority. The language issue has been and still is a significant factor in this country. Attempts to force bilingual status on Canadians citizens has not worked, nor will it work. The universal working language today is English. One language unites, two divide.

The working language in Canada must be English. It is a serious affront to our native people to even consider French and English to be founding languages. A second language of choice is commendable and most desirable. I feel certain that if a referendum were held across this land my views would be supported by a good, large majority.

I greatly admire Quebec's efforts to control its own destiny. In general, they are correct in believing that a strong regional autonomy is the best base on which to build a country. The obvious variations in the Canadian regions make necessary strong regional governments,

knowledgeable and akin to regional problems and requirements.

2020

Federal co-ordination, federal standards, federal regulation on interprovincial matters are primarily the areas that should be handled by the government of Canada. In order to knit this great country together, some of these areas of federal jurisdiction could be defence, standards for education, interprovincial transportation, communication concerns and there are others. I emphasize standards. I do not believe that the federal government should mess around in education, nor the provincial governments. I feel as the first speaker said that per pupil support should be given to the school of their choice, but a standard should be there, a universal standard across the country.

The most important consideration would be the development of a fair system of taxation, having the interest of Canadians as a base rather than the existing competition by all political levels in this extortion process.

Special status for individuals or provinces must not be considered. A spoiled child can never be persuaded to be part of the family by catering to his temperamental whims. Strong regional autonomy is the proper base for future development of a viable nation of such diverse wealth.

As a private citizen of Ontario and Canada, I have grave concerns about the omission of property rights legislation at the federal level. This would encourage pride of ownership and it would discourage oppressive land use regulations and controls. It is imperative that any constitutional update include a property rights clause.

We as Canadian citizens find ourselves overtaxed, overgoverned, unduly burdened with expensive bureaucratic regulations and controls, harassed and completely discouraged by inept governments. It should be obvious that some reasonable changes be made to the existing system.

I suggest a serious look at the so-called Swiss system. The initiative referendum and recall should be considered for inclusion in the constitutional reform or update. This system reactivates democracy as we would wish it to be. Politicians and bureaucrats become accountable and major concerns would be decided by referendum. Sanity could return to a troubled nation.

The foregoing submission results from a lifetime of community participation coupled with observations of events in Canada over the past six decades. We are at a crossroads now. We can turn things around, can proceed in a desirable direction, or we may blow it.

Democracy is not a very good system, but it is the best thus far invented. Decisions for our future must be derived from grass-roots ideas and aspirations and considerations. A nation cannot be built by politicians exercising political power to their own ends at the expense of the people. And I suggest that is what is going on at the present time and has been for some time. We have Quebec playing games and we have the rest of the provinces catering to them for votes and political hanky-panky that you would not believe, and you wonder why the people become discouraged.

I thank you sincerely for this opportunity to make this personal contribution. I simply request your consideration

of this input in your deliberations. Our future may well depend on you.

I have listed some of my activities at the bottom of the page. I do not intend to read them except to mention one fact, that in the past 10 years I have worked across this country in western Canada and throughout Ontario, and the grass-roots feeling is pretty much as I have described it to you. I do not think I am telling you anything that the rest of the people in this country would not tell you unless it is in Quebec and I even have reservations there. I feel the politicians are calling the shots and making the noise and the people are again left to suffer.

Ms Churley: Thank you for your presentation. I guess what you are saying, as a lot of people have said, is that you believe in majority rule and that therefore the minorities, particularly if you have a referendum on French language rights, will be ruled out. The English majority would rule the day. My concern is that I believe governments are elected to protect minorities as well.

The other thing I want to say, which I find interesting, is that I want to very briefly tell you about my election. I did a very unusual thing. I won every poll, literally every poll in my riding. The thing I did was to be very upfront and honest with people. I am a feminist and that is not always popular. I made it very clear to people that I do not tolerate intolerance, that I care about minority rights and care about equality for all. I am an environmentalist and some of my positions may not always be popular.

But I was very upfront with people and I won every poll, and that says something to me about why this New Democratic Party was elected. I do not think many of our stands would be agreed with by all. Surely you know about the NDP position on French language rights from before and what our Premier said. Yet I find it interesting that we have been very upfront as candidates and as a government, I believe. Certainly I believe our party does not represent, I have to say in particular, many of the views that people hold and that we heard today, yet people knew that and they voted for us.

Now I know in this particular riding, not so. But I am just wondering if you think this is a part of why people voted for me and why I won every poll and why other people voted for the New Democrats, that part of what they want at the very least is honesty and to know what the party they elect represents.

Mr Seabrook: I do not think the answer I will give you is the one you would like to hear. I believe that the people who voted for you were so damned sick of this charade they had had that they were welcoming you to the seat of government, and I am right with them. I hope that you in particular follow through on your proposals for social justice.

You spoke of the minority being put upon, if you will. There are many ways the minority can be put upon, and I think the referendum and recall idea protects the minority as well as the majority.

Let's take a look at Meech Lake. It should have gone to a referendum. Let's take a look at the GST. It should have gone to a referendum. All these problems which have further

divided and have cost millions of dollars could have been avoided if a proper system of democratic government had been followed.

The Swiss system has worked well for 100 years. Surely to goodness we have enough brains in this country to look at something that works and give it a shot. I think any political party that will come out with that platform will be the next government of Canada. I honestly believe that. I hope they are. I do not care what party it is.

Mr Offer: Mr Seabrook, in your presentation you spoke of not only the use of referendums but also the whole issue of one language. I was just wondering if you would like to share with us, when you go back into the history of the country, you recognize that there were the native people, you recognize that there were French- and English-speaking people, you recognize that since then there has been a great multicultural fabric placed across the country.

As a result there are not only a great many generations of English-speaking people in this province but also many generations of French-speaking people in this province. Do you not think that apart from a referendum there is an obligation, if not a responsibility, if not a rightness on a provincial government to say that this is what this country is and that this is what this province is, and that we have a right, duty and obligation in a very real sense to make certain that this is protected?

2030

Mr Seabrook: I see no reason why there should be two official languages in this country. I have no objections to Quebec speaking French, but I think they should also be taught English. After all, the shoe has been on the other foot for a long, long time. They have been trying to ram French down the rest of this country when the majority of the people in the country are English-speaking. Let them speak French if they will; they have that right and choice.

I think of England, Wales, Scotland and a lot of countries I have visited where their culture is still there and their language is still there, but there is no law that says, "Thou shalt speak two languages." It is totally unnecessary. It is divisive. It has done more to divide this country than if they had simply said we are going to teach English in all schools and a second language of choice.

If they want to use French in Quebec, let them use it. If they want to use Italian in Toronto, that is fine; they do anyway. It will not be lost. It is not lost in Wales. It is not lost in Scotland. Gaelic is still there.

This is nonsense. It is another catering to the spoiled child as far as I am concerned. I am sorry if I seem prejudiced; I am not.

ERNEST MOREAU

The Chair: Ernest Moreau, come on up.

Mr Moreau: Whatever would drag a man out of his house on a night like this to drive 40 miles when he could be home with his kids watching *Cosby*? Simply a love of my country and a concern for its survival.

Now I will play my cards face up so that we will know where I am coming from. I am a French Canadian and

very proud of it, although I was raised in English. I am the grandson of a Quebecker. I am married to the daughter of a Quebecker. My wife's mother tongue is French. She lived and worked in Quebec for several years. My daughters are being educated in the French language, and for good measure I am a passionate, lifelong fan of the Montreal Canadiens. So there is no way I can be neutral when my country is in danger of being torn apart.

We are going through a crisis right now, perhaps the greatest since Confederation. But as the ancient Chinese told us, "Crisis contains two elements: one is danger and the other is opportunity." We are all conscious of the danger, but let's focus tonight on the opportunity, the chance to rebuild this country, to give it a new birth, to make it an even better nation than it has been in the past.

In order to do that we need a framework, some kind of a reference point. What I use more than anything when I think about the country is family life. I am the father of three kids myself and happily married, and the ideal model for how this country should work is marriage and fatherhood and motherhood. I would like to use marriage as a metaphor for nationhood. English Canada is the husband and father; French Canada is the mother and wife. Now that will probably offend some of my macho French Canadian friends, but I cannot help that.

The reason I give them those two roles is the larger population in English Canada which for me is the symbolic equivalent of the man's advantage in physical strength. It does not imply in any way that English Canada should rule over French Canada or lord it over it by the weight of numbers, any more than a man should lord it over his wife through physical brutality. What is needed in both cases is mutual respect and co-operation.

This couple has been together for going on 125 years now, and there are 10 children. For good measure, there are a couple of nephews up in the attic who may eventually be adopted, but we will leave that for another time. As it happens in the human family, the kids resemble the parents to a greater or a lesser degree. I think what confuses the issue for a lot of us is that the eldest daughter bears such a striking resemblance to the mother that people often equate the two. People use the term French Canada and the term Quebec interchangeably, and that leads to a lot of the muddle we are in and a lot of the confusion.

You can see the basis of the misunderstanding. The fact that French Canada is concentrated so heavily in the one province leads to the easy assumption that they are one and the same. But French Canada is spread out in some measure from sea to sea, and English Canada has an important foothold in Quebec. To ignore those facts is to make orphans out of the anglophones in Quebec and the franco-phones in the rest of the nation, and that is unacceptable.

What we should also remember is that even if Quebec were as purely French and the rest of the country as purely English as people sometimes picture it to be, the Quebec people would still be speaking through two levels of government. And that is the other important point. It would be speaking through the National Assembly and through the federal Parliament. And the federal Parliament is and must

remain senior to the National Assembly. In other words, the mother must remain senior to the child.

What we are seeing now, a lot of the voices out of Quebec are coming from the National Assembly. They came last year at Meech Lake, they came the other day in the Allaire report, and they will come soon in the Bélanger-Campeau commission. And they can all be characterized in one way. I would not want to use the term "spoiled child," the way Mr Seabrook did, but a child of a certain age feeling a little restless in the family home, feeling the need for more space, more decision-making power. Up to a point, that is quite well and good. Those of us who have raised teenagers know that at a certain point you have to give them a longer leash and a later curfew and a little more liberty than their younger brothers and sisters. Quebec, after all, is, along with Ontario, the oldest child in the union.

But as we also know if we have raised teenagers, there is a point at which you have to call a halt. The parental authority in the family or in the country has to call a halt at the point where the child is trying to have the comfort and the security of the family home but trying also to have complete and untrammelled liberty of movement. There are people foolish enough to grant that to teenagers, but I am not one of them, and the parental authority in this country should not do the same.

At a certain point, if the child needs that kind of liberty there is only one place to get it, and that is by establishing his or her own home. I do not want to see that happen, and the reason I do not want that to happen is because in the human family when a child leaves home it can be a bitter-sweet occasion: sweet because of the pride and the sense of achievement, but bitter because of the passage of time and the loss to the family. But when a child leaves the human family he or she does not usually take the mother along, and there is no way for the province of Quebec to leave Canada without taking French Canada almost entirely with her. So what we would be confronting is not only a child leaving home, which could be a good thing, but also a divorce, which is never good.

What is Ontario's role in all this? That is the mandate of this commission. As the oldest son of the marriage, Ontario has to walk a very delicate tightrope. We might be tempted, having the same degree of seniority as Quebec, to go for whatever level of liberty and autonomy it is seeking, and we would thereby co-operate in the dismantling of the family home and the divorce of the parents.

2040

So, yeah, we are interested in getting some more powers for Ontario if we can within the legitimate framework of the country, but we have to play the role we always have played in this province, which is a strong defender of the parental authority in the country, a strong defender, that is, of the federal government. And we can do this in a tactful way, in a way not to offend Quebec's sensibilities, but we have to do it very firmly as well.

I do not want to get into the specifics. We are going to be hearing enough of that over the next few months. I will say just in passing, though, that one power I am very sympathetic to Quebec in her ambitions of attainment is some

control over immigration. Speaking as a French Canadian myself, it is really galling that some of us have been in this country for 300 or 400 years and we get somebody in the country whose passport is not even dry yet and he is trying to dictate to the people who have been here all along. That is unacceptable, and I would like to see Quebec have a greater say in immigration in order to protect her language and culture.

Some of you will be getting a little restless at this point, because you are going to be saying—I can hear you thinking it now: "Come on, Moreau, get real. You're speaking as if this is two different sets of people. In the family, the mother and the daughter are distinct individuals. Isn't this kind of artificial and contrived, to be talking as if there are two different people in this family, because it's the same people who send representatives to Ottawa and to Quebec City."

Well, yes, but answer me this: Why did Quebec at one and the same time send Pierre Trudeau's Liberal Party and René Lévesque's Parti québécois in those two different directions if not to play a balancing act between the two governments? It is a game they have played with great skill for ages, and I say that without any rancour. I appreciate their artistry in doing it. I am reminded of two things. One is the old saying that consistency is the refuge of small minds. The other is what Yvon Deschamps used to say in his comedy act, and I think it has a great deal of truth. He used to say: "I want what most Quebecers want. I want an independent Quebec within a strong Canada."

So, yes, the provincial and federal voices of Quebec do come from the same throats, but what we are seeing right now is the provincial voice having pretty well the field to itself. At some point the senior voices, the maternal and paternal voice, of government in this country have to have their say. There was a time when that would let us relax, because there was a time when it would have been inconceivable for any federal member of Parliament to speak against the unity of the country.

I do not want to get partisan, but Mr Mulroney's dangerous strategy of courting PQ support, of fishing in separatist waters, has put that issue in a lot more doubt than I would like to see it. Come the next election, if Lucien Bouchard does as well as some people are forecasting, it will put it in even more danger. But unless and until that happens, what we have to appreciate right now is that we are listening to the daughter speaking and we can grant her a great deal of liberty, but we cannot have her cause the divorce of the parents.

I will just wrap up by saying that we have one of the world's finest countries here, and we should give the best efforts of our hearts and our minds and our wills to the hope that our grandchildren will never have occasion to look back, shake their heads and say we blew it. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Moreau. I will allow one question from Mr Harnick.

Mr Harnick: You have provided this session with a nice balance, and I am grateful for that. I would like to ask you, as far as you are concerned, what would happen to

French Canadians outside of Quebec if Quebec were to separate?

Mr Moreau: We would be orphaned.

Mr Harnick: What would happen to your language and your culture? Could it survive?

Mr Moreau: Vestiges of it would survive. This is where I took exception with Mr Seabrook. If he is content with the nominal amount of Welsh that survives now and the nominal amount of Gaelic, that is one thing, but I want a vibrant and dynamic culture to survive in this country. Realistically, I do not see any chance of that happening if Quebec were to leave. I think it would throw the balance so heavily in favour of the anglophone majority that we would be left in a rearguard action.

Mr Harnick: As a member of a Franco-Ontarian community, do you attempt to force French on people? I keep hearing that. I do not speak French, which I regret, but no one has ever attempted to force me to speak French.

Mr Moreau: I am sick to death of that term, "ram" French down—I have never seen it rammed down anyone's throat. We have a microcosm of the country in Penetang; that is where my daughters go to school. We have a situation that calls for the skill of a Stephen Leacock to do it justice, because there are so many schools and so many different ways to go. We do occasionally see overreaching by the francophones, so that they start to act like an arrogant majority. We also see the equally unseemly spectacle of paranoia on the part of the anglophone majority. There is no more secure language in the world than English, and for anyone to feel paranoid about its survival is just ludicrous.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Moreau.

BRIAN DYMOND

The Chair: Brian Dymond.

Mr Dymond: Hello. I need to be up here, because I have a community, my community, behind me and I would like them to be able to see what I am saying.

The Chair: Sure, whatever you prefer.

Mr Dymond: I would like to thank you for the opportunity to share with the select committee today. As a member of the deaf community, we have come to speak to you. Just last week we got information that there was going to be a travelling committee on the Constitution which would include Gary. Because communication was slow, we were able at the last minute to gather a group of deaf people to come with us tonight, so we are here tonight to represent our community, which is the deaf community.

I know you have received delegations from people in Thunder Bay, North Bay and Sudbury. I have been watching intently on the parliamentary channel. It is very interesting to watch this historical debate between the francophone Ontarians and the anglophone Ontarians, and this group blaming that group and that group blaming this group. What I want to say is that we are all Ontarians, and we too are a community and we have come to speak about that. We are very proud that we have a member of our community on your committee, and that is Gary. This is

historic. He is the first deaf parliamentarian in the world and he is a credit to our community and a credit to Ontario. I just wanted to say that.

As a deaf person, of course we all went to the Milton school, which is a school for the deaf in Milton, where I grew up. There is a large percentage of students in that school who are deaf, but some are mainstreamed with hearing people and we mix. We used to play and communicate well between two cultures, deaf people and hearing people. I graduated around 1989. That was in Milton. When I go back to visit, I do not see that same kind of mingling. But it is interesting to see the traditions and the values of deaf people that are preserved in the school despite the numbers. When we had our rallies last spring to wake up hearing people to accept our legitimate claims as a community, we had Gary as our leader. It is interesting that some of those students from Milton went to that rally.

We do not want to be mainstreamed because we have a very vibrant culture and language, and you can be from a different culture and you can be from a different language and still succeed. Gary is proof of that. Children who suffer under the system of oppression, we need to think about those people and where they go and what happens to them. Sports and other social and recreational activities enhance a person's wellbeing and a sense of community, and these are places where people of different cultures can come together.

2050

Historically speaking, deaf people have been left out of a lot of these things. We have always been left on the sidelines, being told, "No, you can't do this and you can't do that." That leaves us feeling very angry. We are being discriminated against, and it leaves one feeling very depressed. Now it is time for change, and since Ontario is talking about change, we are here to talk about the kind of place where we want to be in society. We do not want to be left out. We have had enough of being on the sidelines. We feel somewhat a kinship to the native people and to the francophone community, who have been mislabelled and shoved to the sidelines for far too long. There are enough small communities in this province which make up the whole province, and you need to look at all of them.

You talk about values. What kind of values do you espouse when you leave people out? I am talking about an Ontario that includes everyone, from hearing people to deaf people to francophones to anglophones. But when you have these proceedings, how much effort did you actually make to include deaf people? And why did we have to get our information at the last minute, because Gary is there? Again, this is an example of people being left out. But we do not want that.

When it comes to our school system, we see hearing people who run the show take us, isolate us in classrooms where we cannot communicate with the other kids. You would have teachers in there who do not know how to teach us. These kinds of things have got to stop. We are very happy that Gary is with us. He is our chance, and Gary has been very active and very important to our community. He has been our lifeline to the government and to the community.

The way he grew up and the way I grew up is very similar. We have very similar sentiments. I grew up close to Hamilton. He grew up in Hamilton, so we knew each other over the years. He went to Gallaudet university; I did not. He has been very frustrated; I have been very frustrated with the system. It has been interesting how we have corresponded over the years, the similarities in experiences, all at the hands of this so-called open-minded majority. I am here to tell you that there is a problem, that our pain has been made invisible, and when you refuse to acknowledge that, it leaves us hurt and it makes us feel left out.

Please, I want you to take a look at the school system. I want you to take a look at the policies and take a look at how people are left out. If you go to these schools, you will see people being left out. If you go into some of the mainstream classes, you will see students unable to speak American sign language because there is no one in there who can do that. We have mime. We have theatre. We have language. We have beautiful parts of our language. But when you see a hearing person trying to communicate with us, just finger spelling, it is deadpan. That is not our language. I come alive and our community comes alive when we see ASL, much the same as I look at the history of Ontario, how francophones and anglophones used to compete together and have fun. The same with the deaf community.

We used to compete against hearing people. And what has happened to this good warm-heartedness of Ontario? What is with all this negative talk? Why are people doing this? It is easy to communicate with people of different cultures and languages. What is your problem? You can gesticulate. I am very fascinated with the francophone community and other Latin communities because they gesture a lot. It is wonderful. It is wonderful to see people of different cultures communicate together. The Ontario Deaf Sports Association—I used to be vice-president of that organization, and again, I try to include people from around the province when we have interprovincial competitions we bring teams, and it was wonderful to see the competition. We elect our president and we bring our teams together and it is wonderful.

We have applied for government funding, and we got turned down. The problem is that sometimes on boards and things you do not often get along, so I have had to disappear from my involvement with that organization, but it is still my culture and it is still my home. Again, you have negative things happening. I see this happening in the broader scope in terms of Ontario and I think we have had enough of quibbling and enough squabbling.

One of the things I would like you to take a look at are the values you espouse, which include us, deaf people. I want you to take a look at the whole picture, not just some people or some communities. I want you to take a look at where we are at and the language we have, which is American sign language. I think you would be fascinated to see that.

You need to hear the legitimate grievances of native people, of francophones, of deaf people and take a look and see how people live on a day-to-day basis and see the love that is in the communities. We are human beings and

we all live here. What is with the paranoia? What is with the fear of, "Oh, a francophone; oh, a deaf person"? Enough talk like that. Enough of that. Let's fight and work together and build Ontario. Let's work together. We can elect new boards of organizations, including my own within the deaf community. We can work for the better.

The old ways of thinking have had their day. It is time to move ahead, just like with our sports organization. When we have interprovincial competitions, those kinds of things bring people together. And our deaf schools—you need to look at those and what is happening in London, the John P. Roberts School. That is another place where we have a deaf school, where they have one building sort of far off, away from the main campus, and there is a hearing school where people are being mainstreamed, and that building stands empty. This was a place of culture. So what did you waste all your money building this for? Then hearing people come and they move in and they make it a high school. Again, this is a form of cultural imperialism, of how you isolate us as deaf people and the same kind of isolation you have seen happen to other communities and other cultures.

So check. Talk to us. Talk with people. Talk to Gary. We are very proud that Gary is there. There are ways to get around the so-called problems—sports, social engagements, those kinds of things. You do not need to worry. You take one step forward, you take two steps forward. Gary is a first step for our community and he is a good example.

There is more to happen. I would like you to respect our language and our culture and to preserve our deaf schools. I do not want to see our schools emptied and have our children mainstreamed, and with Gary's help we will be successful, as tonight he told us about this Constitution committee. We have come out, as have anglophones and francophones and native people who have made presentations. We can work together. We have to respect each other, and if you can see a native person or a deaf person or a francophone or an anglophone or anyone, we all have things to share. We all have things to contribute. Whether someone is blind or someone is in a wheelchair, it should not matter.

I remember Shauna this afternoon, around 4 or 5 o'clock, when she presented. She talked about how she works in an organization that includes lots of disabled people and she talked about the frustration that people have. She is worried about the assimilation. She is worried about the isolation that happens to people, about what happens when a parent takes a child and puts it in an environment where there is no meaningful communication, where our beautiful sign language is in the schools for the deaf and that child is left out of that.

You can imagine the families in Windsor who have to send their child far away. That is true; they do. But if they are isolated back home in a mainstream class, this is not communication. Where is the progress? You are handed an FM system and tried to be made to speak, to talk, but you are a deaf person. You use your eyes to listen. This kind of oppression has got to stop.

We need to take a look at what is happening to the citizens of this province. You need to hear us. I do not know if you will hear me, but I hope you will, and hopefully with Gary there, you can ask him his opinion. Ask us our opinion. I have brought the community here to see. I want you to see. I want you to recognize us. It is important that you see us, that you feel our presence. I want you to understand that. Save our deaf schools. Enough of the schools closing in Saskatchewan. Enough with the mainstreaming. Enough of the cultural imperialism. Enough, enough. Please, people's esteem, people's pride are at stake here.

The world is a global village. The world is getting smaller. What once was a big place has brought people together because of technology. You take a look at what used to happen. Please, use your eyes. Wake up. Take a look at the real people, okay? Do not come with a paternalistic attitude and pity us. That is not what we want. Come and look with your own eyes and look to the co-operation in the community.

I think that is all I want to say to you. Thank you, Mr Chair. I hope that you will listen to what I have to say and that we could make Ontario a better place for deaf people, francophones, the native population, everyone. And let's stop with this closed-mindedness. Open your minds and open your hearts. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Dymond. I think we hear you loud and clear. There is one quick question. Ms Churley.

Ms Churley: I just have more of a comment than a question. I have to say that if I could speak like you, I think I would be very lucky. Gary wrote to me that was an excellent dramatic presentation, and I think we would all agree on that. I think it is the best dramatic speech we have heard all day. It was incredibly good, and I thank you for it.

You communicated to us; it is almost as though you are a mime artist. It was a very tingling, sensitive presentation. I also want to say that Gary is, I think, to the deaf community and politics as Agnes Macphail is to women in politics. Gary can explain to you some day or maybe even right now who Agnes Macphail is. She is a big heroine of his. But thank you very much.

Mr Dymond: You are more than welcome.

The Chair: Thank you.

GRANT DRURY

The Chair: Our final speaker this evening is Grant Drury.

Mr Drury: That is me. I have been unemployed. As a deaf person, if you get two candidates, a hearing person and a deaf person, applying for a job, you fill out the paper. The hearing person can talk; the deaf person cannot. But you present your qualifications on paper, and guess who gets the job? They take your papers in and you wait at home, and next week with anticipation you wait. You maybe get called back and you ask about your chance, and guess who got the job? The hearing person got the job.

Or maybe it is because they are able to speak French. But as a deaf person, I cannot get French. I can only read a

little bit of English. Then people laugh and they think, you know, "Well, here is this deaf person," that I am stupid or something. But I am not. You have to think a little bit about how bilingualism impacts on people who do not have literacy skills.

One of my friends—he is from Guelph—was going on his way to move, to relocate to another place for professional reasons. He was looking for a job, and he wrote a letter to the newspaper and tried to get a job there. He sent it in. He got home and then later, about two or three weeks later, he was called back there. He went back to see about that job and again, the same kind of thing; a hearing person got the job. The deaf person did not. Why does this kind of discrimination happen? You know, we are citizens too. We work hard.

Another fellow wanted to look for a job working for CFB Borden. He went in to apply there, but again, they called in hearing people and they had to call in my daughter to interpret for me. She had to come from the school to interpret for me because I explained that I was deaf. Again, the same kind of thing happens. You go there and they say, "Sorry, no job for you." How come? It is tough.

Now, I am not looking for sympathy. I am looking for people who are going to give me meaningful work. This is the story of many deaf people. We are frustrated here. We are fed up. It is enough. I do not know, maybe you have the answers. Maybe you do not want deaf people to work. Maybe you do not want equality for everybody, something I would like to see.

Look at me. I have two hands. What is the problem? I can drive. I can work. I use my eyes. Hearing people, they yack away, they have the radio on, they are also a danger on the road.

So think about it. I can work hard. I cannot talk with my voice, but hey, my brain is not deaf; my brain is great. So I cannot talk the way you can talk. I am not a hearing person. I am not lazy. I am a bright person, happy to be deaf. I need a chance. Hearing people always get the chance because they can talk, and then we are sort of sidelined again and they say, "No, we need hearing people for this job." How come? That is all I have to say.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Drury.

Mr Drury: You are welcome.

The Chair: Are there any questions? Okay, thank you very much.

That concludes, ladies and gentlemen, the speakers for this evening and for our stop here in Collingwood. I want to again, on behalf of the committee, thank all of those who came out this evening. Apparently we have been told that there was a message that went out through the Enterprise-Bulletin that perhaps the evening session had been cancelled, and we do not know where that had come from, but that may have accounted for some of the people who did not appear. In any event we are happy to have had the people who were here and we did have an interesting evening, as we did an interesting afternoon today. As with the other locations at which we have stopped along our travels, we heard here in Collingwood a number of useful and interesting suggestions that we will have to ponder over

and try to sift through. Again, as in a number of other places, the viewpoints that were expressed were many and varied and sometimes completely opposed to each other, but that too is part of the reality of Ontario that we are trying to also grapple with.

We will continue our hearings over the next two weeks. Next week we spend a day in Toronto and then proceed to Windsor and to some of the other communities in the southwestern part of the province; namely, London,

Kitchener, Brantford and Hamilton. I invite those of you here and those people who are following the proceedings over the parliamentary network to continue to do so if you are interested, as all of our meetings will continue to be televised over the parliamentary channel.

Once again, thank you very much and have a good evening.

The committee adjourned at 2104.

CONTENTS

Thursday 14 February 1991

Reform Party of Canada	.C-391
Edward C. Carter	.C-394
Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada, Huronia Branch	.C-395
Eric Gerhard Bucholz	.C-399
William Gearing	.C-401
Colleen Cooney	.C-403
Bonnie Ainsworth	.C-404
William Cooney	.C-406
Keith Evans	.C-408
Carmen Agius	.C-410
Sheila Slusarek	.C-411
Orillia District Collegiate and Vocational Institute	.C-413
Afternoon sitting	.C-416
Ronald Emo	.C-416
Don Alexander	.C-418
Donald R. MacDonald	.C-420
John Elliot	.C-421
Clayton Long	.C-423
Rebecca Marshall	.C-424
Gordon Tranter	.C-427
Joe Hart	.C-428
Terrence Rodgers	.C-428
Margaret Dawson	.C-429
Shauna Kendry	.C-430
Betty Smith	.C-430
Evening sitting	.C-432
Elroy Belbeck	.C-432
Harry Richardson	.C-434
Owen Sound and District Labour Council	.C-436
Dave and Debbie Kilpatrick	.C-437
Norman Seabrook	.C-439
Ernest Moreau	.C-441
Brian Dymond	.C-443
Grant Drury	.C-445
Adjournment	.C-446

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winner, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Martin, Tony (Sault Ste Marie NDP) for Ms Harrington

McLean, Allan K. (Simcoe East PC) for Mr Eves

Waters, Daniel (Muskoka-Georgian Bay NDP) for Mr F. Wilson

Mahoney, Steven W. (Mississauga West L) for Mrs O'Neill

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis**Clerk pro tem:** Brown, Harold**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Drummond, Alison, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

A20N
C2
1990
052

C-12
1991



C-12 1991

C-12 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Monday 18 February 1991



Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le lundi 18 février 1991

Select committee on Ontario in Confederation

Comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Monday 18 February 1991

The committee met at 1008 in room 151.

The Chair: I welcome those people who are in the audience. This is of course the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are resuming our hearings here in Toronto today in week number three of a four-week schedule that has us in different parts of the province. We will be continuing our travels this week to Windsor, London, Kitchener, Brantford and Hamilton, and as I say we are here today to hear the views of a number of individuals and organizations within the Toronto area.

As I have been saying throughout the process, we are travelling throughout the province in an attempt to hear from individuals and groups across the province on the kinds of things people think are important to us as a province and as a country in the kind of time frame we are in now and the kind of discussions that will ensue on the future of the province and the country, particularly around the social and economic interests and aspirations that people have and what kinds of structures or forms of Confederation will better respond to those needs. We have heard in the two weeks to date a number of interesting and useful suggestions to us which the committee will be digesting and working through, and no doubt in the next two weeks that will be equally as true.

This is a committee made up of representatives from the three political parties here at Queen's Park. I know the people who are here in the room can see the name tags of people, of the members who are here, but because these proceedings are being broadcast throughout the province on the parliamentary channel I will do as I usually do at the beginning of each day's sitting and introduce the members of the committee.

I am Tony Silipo, the Chair of the committee. From the NDP caucus we have Gary Malkowski, Marilyn Churley, Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee, David Winninger, Brad Ward and Ellen MacKinnon. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer and Steven Offer, and Yvonne O'Neill will join us shortly. From the Conservative caucus we have Ernie Eves and Charles Harnick.

We have a number of speakers before us this morning and I should tell the members of the committee that we also have a full afternoon and the list will be made available to us throughout the day. We may be in a position to add a couple of organizations in the afternoon, depending on some things that are being sorted out now.

ASSOCIATION MULTICULTUELLE FRANCOPHONE DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: We will proceed this morning and begin with Alfred Abouchar, de l'Association multiculturelle francophone de l'Ontario.

What I would like to say before Mr Abouchar begins is that we have set aside the time slot of about 30 minutes for

organizations and 15 minutes for individuals. We cannot go beyond that time and we would deeply appreciate it if people are able to keep their comments below that time so as to allow some time for questions by members of the committee, because we find that is also a useful part of the process.

M. Abouchar : Monsieur le Président, mesdames et messieurs les parlementaires, en tant que président de l'Association multiculturelle francophone de l'Ontario et en tant que membre du Conseil consultatif des relations civiques et multiculturelles de l'Ontario, il me fait grand plaisir de vous adresser la parole ce matin pour vous entretenir de sujets qui préoccupent un nombre de plus en plus croissant de citoyens et de citoyennes de l'Ontario en ce qui a trait à l'avenir de notre province au sein de la Confédération canadienne.

Le débat constitutionnel que nous subissons depuis les quelques dernières années prend une ampleur de plus en plus alarmante, principalement à cause de son ambiguïté et des sentiments suscités d'insécurité et d'impuissance qui animent présentement la plupart de nos concitoyens et de nos concitoyennes. Je vous dispenserai alors de la rhétorique habituelle qui tend à réduire l'avenir de ce pays à un jeu de force et de pouvoir entre le Québec et le reste du Canada. Je m'efforcerai aussi de ne pas me laisser prendre par la dramatisation typiquement médiatique d'une telle situation sociopolitique fort complexe, je l'avoue, mais tout de même tangible et réelle. Enfin, je ne vous adresserai pas de sermons sur les bienfaits de la tolérance, de la coexistence, du compromis et d'un Canada renouvelé.

Ma présentation se veut alors fort simple puisqu'elle se propose d'adresser les fondements et le contexte mêmes du débat constitutionnel, vous invitant ainsi à transcender avec moi l'éloquence de la théorie conflictuelle apparente.

Le Canada s'affiche sur la scène mondiale comme un pays qui prône la paix dans le monde et qui se veut un modèle de tolérance sociale. Le Canada se dit officiellement bilingue tout en se flattant de ses aptitudes multiculturelles. Le Canada se veut un pays exemplaire par son immigration croissante, sa diversité culturelle, sa civilité, son pacifisme, sa technologie et surtout sa conscience sociale en ce qui a trait à l'amélioration des conditions de vie et de l'environnement. Ce Canada que nous remettons en question présentement est encore convoité par des centaines de milliers de personnes à travers les cinq continents.

Pourtant c'est ce même Canada que nous voyons au bord du précipice, que nous avons disséqué, que nous sommes en train d'analyser chacun à sa façon et que nous profitons de refaçonner à l'image soit de nos valeurs ou de nos intérêts personnels. Je me permets alors de croire soit que nous subissons un dialogue de sourds, soit que nous assistons à une négociation très astucieuse à huis clos où l'on suppose que les quelques intervenants traitent de notre

bien collectif. Pourquoi alors ce débat et comment sommes-nous arrivés jusque là ?

Au fin fond des choses, la question est simple et la réponse encore plus simple. Le présent débat est un débat historique entre deux peuples colonisateurs, entre les descendants de deux collectivités qui n'ont jamais réglé leurs différends en ce qui a trait au partage des pouvoirs tant économiques que politiques. Je ne m'aventurerai pas alors à prendre position ou partie dans ce débat, sachant fort bien qu'il est réel et qu'il est fondé sur des injustices et des iniquités passées.

Je me permets pourtant de m'injecter dans ce débat pour contester l'absence des autochtones, la négligence et le manque de considération à l'égard de millions de Canadiens issus de cultures mixtes et de plus de neuf millions de Canadiens d'origines ethniques autres que canadiennes-françaises ou anglaises qui, silencieux jusqu'à présent, attendent encore qu'on les invite à participer à la mise en oeuvre de l'avenir de ce pays. Pourtant, en recevant leur citoyenneté canadienne, ces derniers se sont bien fait dire qu'ils devaient assumer une pleine responsabilité fiscale et sociale et par conséquent, pouvaient dorénavant jouir des mêmes droits et privilèges que tous les autres Canadiens. Mais de quels droits et privilèges parlons-nous et de quels Canadiens parlons-nous ? De quoi parlons-nous finalement ?

Il y a au Canada des Canadiens français et anglais, il y a aussi des autochtones et des minorités visibles et parfois même invisibles. Il y a des anglophones du Québec et des francophones hors Québec. Il y a aussi des allophones, des francophiles, des francogènes, des francophobes, des néo-Canadiens, des groupes ethniques et même des multiculturels, tout comme si cela pouvait vraiment exister. On parle de société distincte pour les Québécois de souche et de culture uniquement pour les francophones hors Québec et on enchaîne le tout dans la constitution canadienne et dans la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, et même dans les lois de ce pays. On voit alors Statistique Canada se hâter de fournir d'une façon incontestable la preuve des nombres justificatifs pour permettre au législateur d'articuler de nouvelles lois correctives à l'égard de ceux qui ont légalement le droit de parole.

Pour certains c'est le moment ou jamais, pour d'autres, animés de remords ou d'intérêts, c'est l'ouverture, le compromis et la tolérance. Les agents multiplicateurs de la bonne nouvelle se multiplient et le débat s'intensifie. Le Canada se polarise et les pôles se multiplient. On mise alors sur les différences, on étiquette, on régionalise, on divise et on partage. Le statu quo est alors rejeté et l'impossible consensus est très recherché. Nous voyons alors se glisser un malaise social qui engendre l'injustice, l'iniquité, la frustration, la haine, le racisme, l'intolérance que nous essayons de confiner par à-coups de commissions parlementaires, d'enquêtes publiques, de procès, de colloques et de forums de discussions. Le malaise est profond et réel et les solutions disponibles demeurent, tant pour les uns que pour les autres, injustes, insuffisantes et non appropriées.

De l'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés aux lois sur les langues officielles et sur le multiculturalisme au niveau fédéral, et de la Loi 8 sur les services en langue française à la création de conseils scolaires

et de collèges communautaires en langue française en Ontario, le débat demeure toujours au niveau du biculturalisme canadien et des droits historiques des Franco-Ontariens de souche dans cette province. Je me dois alors d'attirer votre attention sur le fait que l'article 257a de la Loi sur l'éducation, ainsi que le recensement de novembre 1991 qui s'en vient et qui est prescrit par la Loi sur les élections municipales, récemment adoptée en Chambre par le gouvernement, tirent encore leur définition de « francophone » de l'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés, excluant ainsi volontairement des centaines de milliers d'Ontariens francophones d'origine ethnique autre que canadienne-française.

Pour une province qui se veut multiculturelle, juste et démocratique, il est difficile de concevoir cet état de choses vis-à-vis des francophones de nouvelle souche. Pourtant, c'est la simple vérité.

Quelle est alors la solution à apporter à ce débat constitutionnel ? Que devons-nous faire en Ontario pour résoudre l'impasse ? Que pouvons-nous proposer aux autres provinces pour résoudre cet énigme politique ?

La réponse réside au niveau des deux concepts du bilinguisme et du multiculturalisme. En donnant l'exemple aux autres provinces, l'Ontario devrait reconnaître les deux langues officielles du Canada, les promouvoir et les sauvegarder, offrant ainsi à tous ceux et celles qui le souhaitent l'opportunité de vivre librement leur culture dans la langue canadienne de leur choix.

Il est alors d'une importance capitale de ne plus ghettoïser la communauté franco-ontarienne, de sensibiliser la collectivité multiculturelle anglophone de l'Ontario à l'existence d'une collectivité multiculturelle francophone en Ontario et de mettre en place des lois, des mécanismes et des infrastructures qui reflètent réellement cette orientation. Les conseils scolaires de langue française, les collèges communautaires, les services sociaux et communautaires et le financement public devraient être accessibles à tous les francophones de l'Ontario. Les universités bilingues telles l'Université d'Ottawa, l'Université Laurentienne et le Collège Glendon de l'Université York devraient être mieux financés pour mieux servir et refléter la dualité linguistique, la pluralité culturelle de l'Ontario. L'Ontario devrait enfin reconnaître la spécificité linguistique et la pluralité de la société québécoise et exiger que les présents porte-parole de cette province incluent les autochtones, les anglophones ainsi que les allophones qui y résident.

1020

Quant au gouvernement fédéral, l'Ontario devra exiger que les lois et les programmes des langues officielles et du multiculturalisme fédéraux soient amalgamés pour mieux refléter le bilinguisme et le multiculturalisme canadien.

Mes suggestions sont simples et justes et reflètent selon mes observations les sentiments d'un très grand nombre d'Ontariens et d'Ontariennes. Elles se doivent toutefois d'être considérées dans une nouvelle perspective, d'une société fondée sur le respect des individus, des langues et des cultures. Le bilinguisme et le multiculturalisme canadiens demeurent encore à ce jour les seuls fondements réels et solides sur lesquels pourra se façonner le Canada de l'avenir, et l'Ontario se doit de les considérer très sérieusement

et de les articuler pour démontrer au reste du Canada ce qu'est en réalité ce principe fondamental et encore théorique du bilinguisme et du multiculturalisme canadiens. Merci.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Abouchar. Are there questions?

Mr Harnick: Sir, I have listened with interest to your remarks. Having been to a number of centres in Ontario, I can tell you that your remarks would be greeted with joy in some places and with outrage in others. How do we reconcile those differing views of Ontarians in terms of recognition of francophone rights, multiculturalism, and the other side of the coin which does not want to recognize any of that? Is there a middle ground? Can Bill 8 possibly be seen as that middle ground, and can Bill 8 be implemented in such a way that it will meet everyone's needs in terms of the values that Ontarians have in their society?

Mr Abouchar: I will attempt to answer your question, or the two questions that you have asked, by saying that I honestly believe that most Ontarians are very tolerant towards bilingualism and multiculturalism. You have mentioned Bill 8. You have mentioned the right of francophones. I think the whole debate has been wrongly presented to the population of Ontario.

Assuming that Ontario has already started by accepting multiculturalism in its anglophone community, which is the majority, one has to look at Bill 8 and see how francophone rights have been presented to the rest of Ontario. They have been presented in a context of biculturalism. It has been presented as a historical right of a group of people living in Ontario who are organizing themselves in a certain way, without really being part of this province in their infrastructure.

We have school boards and colleges, we have social services being presented and offered to Franco-Ontarians. I think the rest of the population is sitting there and watching and wondering why the province and Canada are putting so much energy, effort and money on one ethnic group. I know this community does not like to be called an ethnic group, but we are all from an ethnic background.

If the francophone community in Ontario is presented to the rest of the population as a multicultural francophone population, I am pretty sure that the anglophone multicultural community of Ontario will accept bilingualism and will accept the rights of francophones. This does not exclude any rights to the Franco-Ontarian community, but I think in a multicultural society it becomes very difficult to accept the historical point of view of Canada. Ontario is changing, Canada is changing and I think we have to talk about interculturalism and respect for all cultures, not one or two or three specific cultures because of history.

Ms Churley: Thank you very much for your interesting presentation. My question is based on some comments we heard. You have the benefit here and we have the benefit now of being into our third week and have heard from a variety of different people. My question is around what you think would happen to French rights in Ontario if Quebec were to separate in some fashion. Certainly we have heard different opinions on that, but I would like to hear yours.

Mr Abouchar: What would happen to the francophone community of Ontario if Quebec separates?

Ms Churley: Yes. Do you think it is dependent in some ways on the strength of Quebec pushing for French rights?

Mr Abouchar: I do not think so. I have mentioned Statistics Canada. I think it is part of the problem and part of the political game being played in this country. We know from Statistics Canada, and it has been very hard to get, that there are over 1 million people in this province, one out of nine, who are defined as francophone, but we still continue to define la francophonie as being 500,000 Franco-Ontarians with rights and specific needs, without considering another very important part of la francophonie that is not being recognized in this province. Bill 8 has been a problem for this community because it has been defined as a solution to a specific historical problem.

Ontario is on the right track with Bill 8, if Bill 8 is interpreted as a French-Language services act where all the francophones, all the new Canadians who come to Ontario and who chose to live in French, can have access to services, not in terms of numbers and not in terms of history. I think Ontario can live as a bilingual society, respecting all the components of the society and can flourish as a bilingual province and be a model for the rest of Canada. I have to say that Quebec also has a very important multicultural community and is not basically a Québécois society or a purely Québécois society. One tends to forget that in the debate because the multicultural community, the francophone multicultural community in Quebec and in Ontario is not organized and is not politicized.

M. Beer : Ma question se porte à la question qui vient d'être posée au sujet de la francophonie multiculturelle en Ontario et au Québec. Est-ce que vous voyez des similarités ou des différences entre, disons, les francophones multiculturels à Montréal ou à Québec en comparaison avec Toronto ou Ottawa, et est-ce qu'il y a peut-être un besoin et un moyen par lesquels l'AMFO peut jouer un rôle avec les francophones multiculturels au Québec ? Qu'est-ce qui arrive maintenant entre ces deux communautés ? Parce que de plus en plus, comme vous dites, Montréal est en train de devenir une ville multiculturelle comme Toronto, même si c'est plutôt du côté francophone multiculturel et là vous avez peut-être un rôle important à jouer.

M. Abouchar : Je pense tout d'abord qu'il faudrait s'en sortir du concept de multiculturalisme francophone à Toronto et peut-être à Ottawa. Le multiculturalisme francophone est présent dans toutes les parties de la province de l'Ontario pour commencer, sauf que cette communauté n'est pas connue, on n'est pas visible. Pour répondre à votre première question, la comparaison entre les francophones du Québec et les multiculturels francophones du Québec et de l'Ontario, je pense que nous vivons tous les mêmes problèmes de Canadiens de nouvelle souche depuis 20, 30 ans, sauf que les multiculturels francophones du Québec s'associent avec la majorité de la province. Donc, il y a une dynamique de groupe qui est totalement différente. Tandis que, dans notre cas ici en Ontario, les ethno-culturels francophones qui veulent se joindre à la

francophonie ontarienne retrouvent une communauté fermée, très prise par ses problèmes, par ses débats, par ses acquis qui a peur de les intégrer et qui dans certains cas voudrait uniquement les assimiler, par peur de perdre cet élément culturel qui n'a jamais été défini mais qui est très omniprésent dans le débat politique.

1030

D'un autre côté, cette communauté multiculturelle francophone se sent étrangère face à la communauté multiculturelle anglophone de l'Ontario et à l'anglophonie ontarienne, ce qui fait que nous nous sentons double minoritaire dans cette province. On se fait toujours dire : «Attendez qu'on finisse avec les problèmes de la francophonie ontarienne pour s'occuper de vous».

C'est là où se trouve la différence entre les francophones multiculturels du Québec et ceux de l'Ontario. Je pense que, depuis deux ou trois ans, les multiculturels francophones de l'Ontario se mobilisent, s'organisent. Le débat est extrêmement difficile, étant donné que nous n'avons pas vraiment accès aux finances dans les langues officielles puisque les langues officielles, c'est en réalité un département de biculturalisme.

Les francophones multiculturels du Québec commencent aussi à se mobiliser et à s'organiser politiquement. Je pense que dans les 20 prochaines années, la communauté multiculturelle francophone du Canada — et on a commencé avec l'Alberta — va créer un front commun de francophones au Québec et francophones hors Québec. Mais j'espère que ça ne sera pas pour entrer en conflit avec qui que ce soit mais plutôt pour essayer de s'intégrer à une communauté qui ne réalise pas encore l'existence et la richesse que peut apporter cette nouvelle francophonie dans le pays.

J'espère avoir répondu à votre question.

M. Winninger : Est-ce que vous dites que le gouvernement de l'Ontario doit offrir un appui financier à toutes les cultures en Ontario ?

M. Abouchar : Non, ce n'est pas nécessairement ce que j'ai dit. Je dis que le gouvernement de l'Ontario devrait être un chef de file dans la reconnaissance du bilinguisme officiel du Canada et dans ses programmes gouvernementaux : promouvoir non seulement un groupe ethnique mais tous les groupes ethniques comme il le fait au niveau de la communauté anglophone, mais le faire aussi au sein de la communauté francophone.

Si vous prenez toutes les subventions qui sont données soit par le fédéral ou le provincial à cette communauté de francophones hors Québec ou de Franco-Ontariens, je pense qu'il y a un réaligement des acquis au niveau de la province qui ferait en sorte que la francophonie multiculturelle puisse se joindre à la francophonie ontarienne et la province de l'Ontario pourrait être un exemple de société au Canada et dans le monde.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : Mr Abouchar, we have met with a number of students, young people, and I guess the strength of their message was the strongest in Sudbury, when we had francophone students literally begging us, with great emotion, for the establishment of a French-language university and certainly more community colleges.

I am not sure that is the impression you gave, because you talked about Glendon and you talked about the University of Ottawa, so would you say a little bit about the interpretation that you give to the establishment of bilingual post-secondary institutions, or unilingual English/French post-secondary institutions?

Mr Abouchar : I can answer your question by maybe asking you a question. How many of these students were of non-Franco-Ontarian origin? I am pretty sure I know the answer, and it brings back the subject I have been discussing with you this morning, that the multicultural francophone community is politically absent in Ontario. It is very real. It is everywhere, except that it is very far away from the political infrastructure that you know and that we all know in this province.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : I thank you very much for explaining that so well, the difference between Ontario and Quebec multicultural francophones. You have done it very well.

Mr Abouchar : What I am trying to say is that when we have a debate, when we have a commission, when we have inquiries around the province, you will not find the multicultural francophone community present. All the ideas you are getting are coming from one single community, which is very active, which has its right to request a Franco-Ontarian university because that is the mandate that they have, that is the way they see the preservation of their culture.

What I am trying to add to this is that there are more francophones in this province and more numerous francophones than the Franco-Ontarians who are in bilingual universities, who are in bilingual colleges, who are trilingual.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : And many of them are actually on the staff and faculties of these universities.

Mr Abouchar : Some of them, in some universities, yes. I do not think this community wants to be ghettoized in the name of the preservation of a culture. We want to be Canadian. We want to be bilingual. We want to share with all cultures in this province. We do not want to live only with francophones and that is the difference between the Franco-Ontarian community, which has its historical perspective, and the new Canadians who are coming to Canada who want to live with the société d'accueil, which is the Franco-Ontarian community in this province, but who also want to be with the anglophone community and the multicultural anglophone community, and that is the difference between the two collectivities right now.

Mrs Y. O'Neill : So you would say with affirmation then that you want bilingual post-secondary institutions?

M Abouchar : Yes, and if the Franco-Ontarian community wishes to have a Franco-Ontarian university, we will work with them to have a Franco-Ontarian university, but not by destroying the bilingual and multicultural communities at the post-secondary level that we have right now.

The Chair : Last question, Mr Offer.

Mr Offer : My question is really a pickup of a certain line of questioning that Mr Winninger brought forward and I am wondering if you might be able to share with us. Do you feel that there is a role for Ontario to play in terms of

the principles underlying Bill 8 and expanding that to the multicultural community, in that the provision of services and the role that Ontario can play is that the provision of services in areas where numbers warrant should not be limited just to French, but should be expanded to a wide variety of multicultural groups? I am wondering if you might be able to expand on that, if that is your position?

Mr Abouchar: Our position is very simple. I think the preamble of Bill 8 should be amended because right now it is being interpreted as a Franco-Ontarian bill, the preservation of the patrimoine culturel des francophones, meaning Franco-Ontarian, in this province and that is how it is being implemented right now. So I think the first item on the agenda should be an amendment to the preamble of Bill 8. Bill 8 by itself should be widened so that all francophones in this province would have access to services. I know it is a costly proposition, but I think it is a must in a province which attempts to recognize the reality of the francophone community and which attempts to serve all Ontarians. We will find, by doing that, that we can double the number of francophones in this province who can use the services that the government is putting forward for the francophone community.

M. le Président : Thank you. Merci, Monsieur Abouchar d'avoir ajouté une perspective importante à nos discussions.

CHRISTOPHER STEWART

The Chair: I call Christopher Stewart.

Mr Stewart: I would like to first direct you to the title page of my presentation, entitled *The More Things Change, The More Things Stay The Same*. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak on the future of Canada. I have divided the following presentation into the following categories: How Meech failed; how the amending formula should be changed before entering into any new negotiations; a solution for the Quebec question; a critique of the triple E—elected, equal, effective—proposal for Senate reform and my own alternative proposal; a proposed resolution for the aboriginal question; and an examination of two proposals being recommended for use in this round of constitutional negotiation, the constituent assembly and the public referendum.

First, let me start by saying that I love a bilingual, multicultural Canada. I feel this country has benefited greatly by being born out of both the French and English cultures and the addition of more cultures has led to Canada becoming the greatest nation on Earth.

I do not think Quebec will ever separate from Canada, because any proposal from the Quebec government, whether it be from the Parti québécois or the Liberals, always calls for more provincial powers while establishing a stronger economic union. The heart of the matter is that Quebec cannot afford to separate from Canada. Also, I want all Canadians to understand that we as a nation have been discussing constitutional issues since 1926 and therefore there is no real constitutional crisis in Canada. What we need now is not people speaking solely from the heart, but people using rational thought before taking one position over another.

1040

Let us look at why the Meech Lake accord failed. For me the accord did not fail because the process was too undemocratic, a complaint of the 1982 agreement as well, but rather because of the amending formula. Let us remember that when Premier Bourassa presented his five conditions for Quebec acceptance of the 1982 constitution, two required unanimous consent.

What happens now to these two conditions is that every political leader holds the power to veto any agreement. When one holds the power to block an agreement, why should one negotiate? The recent Meech experience demonstrates my point. The two men ultimately responsible for killing the accord, Elijah Harper and Clyde Wells, never offered any alternatives. All Canadians heard from these two men was that the accord was unacceptable. Even at this time, with the accord dead, neither of these two men has offered the voters of Canada their view of a new Canada.

Another problem in the amending formula is the amount of time given to pass an agreement by the 11 legislatures after one is reached by the first ministers. When one has three years, there is a tendency for people to wait until the last minute before trying to receive formal legislature approval. Also, this three-year time period allows the agreement to become blurred. Instead of being an issue about holding the country together, it becomes simply a political issue.

This was demonstrated when the Manitoba government refused to pass the accord because the CF-18 contract had been awarded to Montreal over Winnipeg. In my opinion a constitutional agreement affecting the whole country is far more important than a contract to build airplanes.

Finally, the three-year time period allows for new leaders and governments to enter into the scene. When this happens, we are forced to re-open negotiations because new issues come forward.

I would suggest that the following changes should be made to the amending formula: first, that the time period be reduced from three years to one; second, that the unanimity requirement be dropped and that all amendments require the two-thirds/50% approval; finally, that the only House that needs to pass the amendment is the House of Commons.

I will now further explain each point. I would like to see the time requirement decreased, because as I have stated before the issues sometimes become clouded. The agreement on constitutional issues is paramount and it is a difficult task to get a constitutional agreement. So once an agreement is secured we should immediately ensure official legislative passage and focus our attention on more pressing needs. Also, if new governments come to power it is quite unlikely that they would want to ratify an agreement they were against while in opposition. No new government follows the old agenda; it sets its own.

The reason to drop the unanimity requirement can be easily demonstrated by examining the events that led to the agreement in 1982. Prior to the decision reached by the Supreme Court of Canada, there was a solid coalition of provinces dubbed the "gang of eight." This was when the

political leaders thought unanimous consent would be needed to patriate the Constitution. After the Supreme Court decision which allowed the federal government to go on its own, the gang of eight started to fall apart. I might also remind the committee members that it was after the unanimous consent myth was shattered that we had some real negotiations. Again, unanimity does not force anyone to negotiate when they know they can stop the process.

Finally, the reason I would like to see only the House of Commons pass the agreement is that it would make the system more democratic. The citizens of Canada must realize two important issues: first, that there is no procedure within the present amending formula to co-ordinate the 11 legislative committees that must be set up before legislative approval is given, such that any change to the agreement proposed by any of the 11 committees forces us to re-open negotiations. Simply changing a comma to a period within a constitutional provision can change the whole scope and meaning of that original provision. For this reason, either some co-ordination among the committees is needed or we should have only one committee being set up.

If we had only one national committee and there was widespread public dissent to the agreement, then this committee could formulate alternative proposals that would become the basis for new negotiations. Also, this committee could create a document outlining the possible opposition to an agreement and propose alternatives which would become the base for future negotiations. Instead, as in the present situation, we are faced with numerous complaints. As well, when groups make presentations in front of this one committee, they will be thinking on a national rather than on a provincial level. When one makes a presentation to a provincial committee, one argues on how the agreement will affect the specific province. My proposal would force the public to decide if the agreement is good for the country as a whole rather than how it will simply affect one province.

Turning to the Quebec question, as I have stated before, I do not feel that Quebec will ever separate from Canada. The simple fact is that business and the people of Quebec are now coming to recognize that the province cannot afford to separate. The damage to the province, both at the economic and international level, would be devastating. At the same time, English Canada must realize that Quebec feels a threat to its language and culture.

Any new negotiations must start first with the assumption that the rights protected in the charter are paramount over any other law. Then Quebec should propose what powers it feels are necessary to protect its language and culture. When this proposal is made, the government of Quebec must demonstrate how these powers will protect its language and culture. The federal government should not simply hand over these powers until Quebec demonstrates that these powers are required. Also, any powers offered to Quebec must be offered to all of the other provinces. I do not believe in creating a special legislative status for one province. At the same time, I am quite prepared to recognize the distinct characteristic of Quebec within Canada in the preamble of the Constitution. Doing this would

ensure that we in English Canada realize that there is a different language and culture in Quebec and that this difference is a fundamental part of a prosperous Canada.

I would now like to turn to analysing the most popular Senate reform proposal, the triple E Senate. The triple E Senate calls for equal representation of all provinces and elected senators, which it claims will make the Senate more effective. For me this is an outrageous proposal that threatens national unity more than any separation movement within Canada.

First, this proposal is so undemocratic that I cannot understand how it has any following within the country. What the authors of this proposal are saying is that the value of a person's vote in the less populated provinces is worth more than those from the more populated provinces. Is this what we consider democratic? If you agree, then I would suggest that you find a dictionary and discover the meaning of "democracy."

As well, the authors of this proposal have never demonstrated how this type of Senate would work in conjunction with our system. As you know, we have a British, responsible style of government. This means we have two houses, of which one is elected, and the government must have the confidence of the elected House. The Lower House is distributed on the formula of representation by population, while the Upper House is distributed along regional lines.

With this definition in mind, how can an elected Senate ensure that this will continue? If it is not to continue, then the authors of this proposal must tell the voters how their system would work. There is a group in favour of an elected Senate who argue that the senators should be given some form of suspensive veto. This would mean that the Senate could block but not kill legislation. If this is to be the case, what is the use of having an elected Senate? There are numerous procedural ways for the opposition to block or stall legislation.

I would argue that in Canada, I do not think there are distinct regions. British Columbia has never considered itself part of the western region. The same can be said for Newfoundland and the maritime region. More important, the economic problems Alberta faces are quite different from those of the other two traditional western provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In my opinion, the formula of dividing and grouping the provinces into regions is a thing of the past. Now each province faces distinct political and economical questions.

The authors of this proposal have never discussed how they would break the rules of party discipline. These rules bind the members to vote along party lines. One must realize that running an election is expensive, so potential candidates will need the backing of parties. When a party backs a candidate, it expects this person to toe the party line if elected. How could we avoid this situation? Supporters have called for the senators to be denied the right to run for re-election. If this was agreed to, why would the elected candidate be responsive to his constituents? This would give carte blanche to the senator to say and do as he or she pleases.

1050

The authors of this proposal have not mentioned when elections would be held. Some of them have argued that the elections should be held two years after the federal election. This would mean that the people are not voting for the senators but sending a message to the governing party in Ottawa on how well or badly it is doing. If the elections were held at the same time as national elections, one cannot believe that if a voter votes Liberal for his MP that same person will then turn around and vote Conservative for his senator.

Finally, supporters have argued that this proposal would make the national government more responsive to regional concerns, thus strengthening national unity. For me, quite the opposite would happen. As engaging in an election for two senators is much less expensive than engaging in a national election for their provincial MPs, situations will arise where a party which enjoys support on a provincial level only, such as the Parti québécois or the Social Credit Party in British Columbia, will field candidates for the national level. The candidates from these parties will most likely be concerned more with their provincial concerns than national concerns. One could imagine a Senate dominated by people working to further their province, even at the expense of the national wellbeing. What the supporters of the triple E proposal are doing is switching the Senate from an institution which deals with regional concerns to one which deals with provincial concerns only. Would this strengthen national unity or slowly kill the country?

My alternative is the abolishment of the Senate and at the same time a relaxation of the rules of party discipline. The obvious savings to the taxpayer need not be mentioned if the Senate is abolished, though the relaxation of the rules of party discipline needs further explanation.

If one were to relax the rules of party discipline, the first step would be that Canadians must realize that if the governing party loses a vote it would not have to call an election. Although legally under our rules the party only has to resign if it loses a non-confidence vote, it has become convention in our system that if the governing party loses a vote it must resign. The governing party would need to ensure the support of their members only on important pieces of legislation. On money bills or bills that are part of the government election platform, the MPs would be required to follow the party line. Loosening of party discipline would increase the role played by the ordinary MP.

Let me remind the committee that this is not a radical suggestion, because this is how the system in the United Kingdom works. What is important is that my alternative would ensure that the elected members are working first for their constituents, then for the nation as a whole. The triple E Senate has the senators working first for their provinces, second for their constituents and finally for the nation.

In closing, the triple E senate would not be effective, elected and equal. It would end up being undemocratic and destructive to the country.

The Chair: Excuse me. You are getting towards the end of the time. If you could sum up, perhaps, the rest of the brief.

Mr Stewart: There are only about four pages left. Would it be possible to continue?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr Stewart: One of the most important problems facing Canadians today is resolving outstanding land claims with the aboriginal community. Before one can try to answer this question, we must first answer two other questions. Do aboriginal people want to be considered as Canadian citizens? If they want to consider themselves citizens of the first nations, should their claims be addressed in our constitution? Second, how do we view history? Did the European settlers conquer the aboriginal people or did we come over and form an agreement with the aboriginal people to develop a new nation where all would be equal partners? Determining each person's feelings about these questions determines how we approach the aboriginal problem.

I myself take the view that the Europeans conquered the native population. At the same time, I am only willing to accept that aboriginal land claims be addressed in our Constitution if the aboriginal community accepts that they are full members of the Canadian nation. This means they obey our laws, pay taxes and function as normal Canadians do. If aboriginal people do not see themselves as citizens of Canada, then their claims should not be addressed within the Constitution but rather through agreements between the individual aboriginal leaders and the federal government.

I would argue that the goals and aspirations of the aboriginal community are quite splintered. What one group from Ontario wants is quite different from what another group from Alberta wants. That is why I am calling for the reserve system to be abolished and for aboriginal people to be brought into Canadian society. Let me point out that at this time I do not believe the eradication of the reserve system would solve all the problems facing the aboriginal community, but I believe it is a step forward to solving these problems.

I believe the Indian Act has created a situation of social despair for the aboriginal community. The act has taken the incentive away from the aboriginal people to find work. As well, the continuation of the reserve system will ensure that racism towards aboriginal peoples continues.

As the aboriginal community is placed away from society, people do not understand the hopes and fears of the aboriginal community. On occasion, when someone is scared or does not understand something, this usually turns into hatred. Also, most leaders of the aboriginal community argue that they need the reserves to protect their culture and traditional lifestyle. The leaders argue that by keeping the aboriginal people away from the white community it will ensure that their lifestyle is protected. I would argue that their lifestyle is not under attack from the white community, but rather technological change. Technological change has created a situation where my life is different from my father's. I would rather see aboriginal

people brought into society instead of being kept on the outside looking in. Clearly, Canadians as a whole would benefit if they had daily contacts with aboriginal people. Both groups could learn from each other to create an improved and more tolerant Canada.

I would now like to turn my attention to two new proposals that may be used in this round of constitutional negotiation. I argue that neither of the methods should be used. Let me first deal with the constituent assembly proposal, and then I will turn my attention to the use of a public referendum.

The constituent assembly is being proposed by the eminent scholar Peter Russell. Professor Russell is considered one of the top academics in the political science field. His proposal is that the legislatures send an all-party delegation to negotiate for the province. At the same time, this group could select any members from the private sector to accompany it on these negotiations. As well, Professor Russell has proposed that as Quebec has stated it will only negotiate with the federal government, we could have one constituent assembly for English Canada and then we could send a delegation to negotiate with Quebec. I am currently in a class being taught by Professor Russell and I have great respect for him, but this proposal will never work.

The first problem involves the negotiating process with Quebec. For me, we are giving Quebec a moral victory if we negotiate in the way Professor Russell has proposed. It would imply to Quebec that we in English Canada feel it is more important than the other provinces and that in reality it is almost a separate nation. I for one am not willing to say this.

Second, Professor Russell proposes that members from the private sector could be included in the negotiations. Professor Russell has argued that by including the leaders of such groups as aboriginal, women or multicultural, the process will be more democratic. I would argue that for three reasons this will make the negotiations more undemocratic.

For me, the inclusion of people who have not been elected in these negotiations is offensive. What recourse will the average voter have to these people? At least with politicians, we have a chance of voting them out of office. As well, why would any of these leaders of private interest groups negotiate? They are there to ensure that the interests of their members are answered. They are not there thinking of what is good for the country as a whole. The final reason is that Professor Russell's proposal is only spreading out the group of elites involved instead of involving the average voter.

There are two final problems with this proposal.

One, politicians will not stake out any constitutional positions during the election. As all-party assemblies will be used, the politicians will argue that they cannot formulate a constitutional position until they consult with the other political parties. The voter has a right to know how a certain politician feels about basic constitutional issues.

Two, the inclusion of all these groups will make the negotiating process impossible. First, there will be too many issues on the table. I believe the process of dealing with one issue at a time is the proper approach. Second, as I have stated previously, the leaders of these private sector

groups will not negotiate but hold out until they get everything they want. I was quite dismayed that a person with such a high stature in Canada could come out with such a proposal that would make constitutional agreement almost impossible.

I would now like to discuss the possibility of holding a national referendum. I would like to remind the members of this committee that there are no provisions within the amending process to allow for public referenda. Also, a referendum system will place Canada in a constitutional straitjacket. In Australia, where a national referendum system exists, there have only been eight amendments, while our elitist-driven formula had 24 amendments. So a referendum system could make constitutional amendments even more difficult than they already are.

I would also argue that if we wish to create unity through constitutional agreements, a referendum system will divide the country beyond recognition. A referendum will split apart families, towns, cities and even provinces. When the votes are counted, each province will know which other provinces supported them. I plead, as a person who went through the referendum in Quebec and saw personally how devastating this process can be on families, against having a national referendum system. As well, I wonder how we could have a national referendum when 80% of the voters said they did not understand the Meech Lake accord. I am not saying the average voter is not intelligent, but only trained individuals can understand the workings of a Constitution.

In closing, I have a message to all Canadians. Please realize that we are not in a crisis situation when we have been discussing constitutional issues for 65 years. Second, when agreements are reached, people should not get over-excited. One will never know what kind of Constitution we have until the courts get through interpreting the agreement. If one examines the original intent of the "peace, order and good government" clause and what emerged from court interpretations, one can see two entirely different views. I would also argue that we must not negotiate any new constitutional agreements for a minimum of 20 years. This time period will allow for future leaders to fully comprehend how the judiciary has interpreted the agreement.

1100

Finally, I would reiterate that we are not in a crisis situation. The calls that we are in a crisis situation are coming from the academic community, which wishes to ensure that it have political consulting jobs and a market for its books. I would say the only good thing that has come out of these constitutional talks is that future political scientists like myself are presented with numerous opportunities in this growth industry of constitutional politics.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Stewart. Because you have gone over time, we are going to have to carry on with the next speaker. There will not be any time for questions, I am afraid.

ROBERTO PERIN

The Chair: I call Roberto Perin.

M. Perin : Monsieur le Président, honorables députés, je me présente devant vous ce matin en tant qu'auteur et

historien, et en tant que personne qui a médité les problèmes du Canada depuis une bonne vingtaine d'années.

Je crois que l'Ontario, à cause de son poids démographique et économique, peut jouer un rôle très important dans le réaménagement constitutionnel qu'on est appelé à vivre dans les prochains mois et les prochaines années.

Je crois qu'il serait souhaitable que l'Ontario se fasse le porte-parole d'une vision d'un Canada pluraliste, tolérant, où les peuples, en somme les communautés culturelles et linguistiques, puissent se sentir chez elles. Je crois qu'il est difficile à l'heure actuelle de prévoir quelle sorte de Canada on va avoir suite à ces discussions constitutionnelles. Chose certaine, je crois que le Québec aura beaucoup plus de pouvoir dans les domaines social et culturel.

Je crois aussi que la population du Québec, relativement à la population du reste du Canada, s'en va en diminuant et qu'il faut donc prévoir dans les années à venir qu'il va y avoir plus de pouvoir qui ira au Québec. Il est tout à fait naturel qu'on veuille concentrer le maximum de pouvoir politique au Québec, qui est la seule province à majorité francophone.

Quel que soit le nouvel arrangement constitutionnel, il y a des choses qui ne changeront pas. Le fait est qu'il y a au nord du 49^e parallèle une entité géographique où il y a à l'heure actuelle 19 millions d'anglophones et 6 millions de francophones. Quel que soit l'arrangement constitutionnel, que ce soit la superstructure de M. Bourassa ou des commissions mixtes qui géreront, n'est-ce pas, l'économie de cette entité géographique, il est clair qu'il va y avoir un fonctionnariat qui va devoir fonctionner dans les deux langues et que le bilinguisme, quel que soit l'arrangement auquel on arrivera avec le Québec, existera à mon avis pour toujours.

Alors, je veux me poser la question : est-ce que la décentralisation de pouvoir à l'égard du Québec doit nécessairement entraîner la décentralisation des pouvoirs à l'égard des autres provinces ? À mon avis la réponse devrait être non, parce que le Canada a joué un rôle très important dans la préservation de la culture canadienne-anglaise au niveau fédéral. Ottawa a toujours joué un rôle très important en créant des institutions qui font que le Canada peut se distinguer des États-Unis. Alors, même si le Québec devenait plus autonome, souverain ou même indépendant, je crois qu'au Canada anglais il faut un gouvernement fort, et je crois que l'Ontario pourrait se faire le porte-parole de cette vision, d'un gouvernement à Ottawa qui conserve les aspects du pays qui sont distincts des États-Unis.

Je crois aussi qu'en se faisant le porte-parole d'un gouvernement central fort, il faut aussi qu'il se souvienne que l'Ontario a toujours été pour un gouvernement central fort mais que ce n'est peut-être pas pour des motifs d'équité à l'égard des autres régions, que souvent l'Ontario s'est fait le porte-parole de cette vision du Canada pour promouvoir ses propres intérêts. Je crois donc que l'Ontario devrait se montrer sensible aux besoins des autres régions, peut-être en adoptant certaines des formules que l'Ouest, par exemple, suggère en ce moment : l'élection d'un sénat qui représente toutes les régions également et peut-être une Cour suprême dont les juges soient désignés sur listes fournies par les provinces. À mon avis, l'importance d'un gouvernement central fort au Canada est évident ; l'histoire le démontre.

Il y a trois domaines dans lesquels ce gouvernement doit faire sentir son poids : dans le domaine culturel, le domaine social et le domaine économique. Alors je me pose aussi la question : quel sera le visage culturel du Canada advenant un Québec souverain ou même indépendant ? Et j'ai lu avec beaucoup d'intérêt un article d'un éditeur au *Globe and Mail* qui suggérerait que le bilinguisme et le multiculturalisme seraient abolis si le Québec devenait souverain ou indépendant. Je crois qu'au contraire, l'Ontario devrait réaffirmer ses politiques et faire en sorte qu'elles soient respectées ailleurs au Canada.

Pourquoi, par exemple, le bilinguisme ? Pourquoi devrait-on renforcer les droits des francophones en Ontario ? Parce que tout d'abord ils constituent 500,000 et plus si on s'en tient à la présentation du premier intervenant ce matin — 500,000 personnes au moins qui ont le français comme langue maternelle et qui parlent cette langue couramment.

Il est donc important de donner à cette minorité la possibilité de s'exprimer et de s'épanouir. Il faut se rappeler aussi que les francophones sont ici depuis le tout début de l'histoire de la province et qu'ils forment des communautés consistantes dans le nord et dans l'est de la province. Donc, je crois que le gouvernement de l'Ontario devrait reconnaître le droit à ces francophones de contrôler et de gérer leurs institutions sociales et culturelles. Ils devraient avoir leurs propres conseils scolaires à travers la province, des collèges communautaires et une université francophone. Je crois que la Loi 8 devrait être renforcée de sorte que les francophones à travers la province de l'Ontario pourront avoir accès aux services gouvernementaux en leur langue tant sur le plan local que sur le plan de la province.

L'Ontario ne peut pas reculer dans ce domaine, il doit aller de l'avant. Il doit se faire le porte-parole des droits linguistiques des francophones auprès des autres provinces et participer activement aux organismes francophones internationaux afin de se faire le promoteur de la langue et de la culture française, qui est après tout une composante culturelle de cette province.

Pour ce qui est des communautés culturelles, il est inconcevable, à mon avis, qu'on abolisse le multiculturalisme. D'ailleurs, je me demande comment on réussirait à bafouer si facilement les droits des communautés culturelles qui se sont affirmées dans ce pays depuis une bonne vingtaine d'années. Les immigrants et leurs enfants et leurs petits-enfants doivent avoir un sentiment de fierté dans leurs racines culturelles. Ils doivent se sentir part entière de cette société en Ontario. Alors, il faut d'une part que l'Ontario continue à promouvoir le pluralisme et la fierté des origines, et d'autre part qu'il fasse en sorte que les immigrants se sentent partie intégrante de la société d'accueil. Je crois aussi qu'il faut absolument que l'Ontario continue les politiques de promotion des minorités visibles dans la province et qu'il consolide ces politiques.

Pour ce qui est des Amérindiens, je sais que cette question relève tout d'abord du fédéral, mais je crois que, dans ce processus de renégociation constitutionnelle, l'Ontario peut faire peser son poids dans la balance sur cette question et je crois qu'il faut que l'Ontario se fasse le porte-parole d'une résolution juste et équitable des revendications territoriales

des Amérindiens à travers le Canada. Sur son propre territoire, il doit leur reconnaître le droit de contrôler et de gérer leurs affaires dans les domaines municipal, policier, juridique, éducatif, hospitalier et social. Il doit reconnaître la priorité du droit aborigène dans les territoires amérindiens.

1110

À mon avis, le processus de réaménagement constitutionnel peut être créateur. On peut concevoir un meilleur Canada, un Canada plus tolérant, plus humain, plus équitable. L'Ontario, à mon avis, est bien placé pour assurer qu'on en arrive là. À cause de sa proximité du Québec et des multiples liens qui unissent les deux provinces, l'Ontario peut se faire le trait d'union entre les aspirations du Québec et celles du Canada anglais. À cause de son importante minorité francophone, il peut se faire le porte-parole des droits linguistiques.

À cause de sa population multiculturelle, multiraciale et multiethnique, il peut revendiquer un Canada plus tolérant, plus juste, plus sensible à l'endroit de la diversité. Il faut, pour ce faire, une vision. Le défi est devant vous ; il suffit que vous cueilliez le défi.

M. le Président : Nous avons quelques questions. Mrs O'Neill first.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr Perin. I found that you have a vision, you yourself. I am glad you are in the position you are. I found it uplifting. I do still have one point of the matter that I do feel I would like you to say a little bit more about. Throughout the entire paper you are talking about Ontario's leadership role, and I am not as sure as you are that a couple of changes to Senate and judges would assure us the co-operation of all the other provinces of Canada, so I wonder if you have thought more about that. Because, you know, we go into the so-called front with a whole lot of people, with a whole lot of ideas that big Ontario is making all the rules again. You seem to say a couple of amendments at the central level, and they are institutional amendments, would fix that. Can you allay my fears?

M. Perin : Il est évident qu'il y a d'autres problèmes. Il y a des problèmes économiques, par exemple, des problèmes de répartition de la richesse qui ne seront pas résolus par de simples amendements juridiques, constitutionnels ou institutionnels.

Je sais aussi que les provinces Maritimes ont leur propre agenda et que les provinces de l'Ouest, par contre, vont dans une autre direction. Mais je crois que même dans l'Ouest il y a un désir de doter le Canada d'un gouvernement central fort. Ce n'est peut-être pas l'opinion de tous, mais je pense que c'est une opinion majoritaire. Je crois qu'il faut aller de l'avant, qu'il faut reconnaître que ces changements institutionnels ne changeront pas la structure de base sociale ou économique mais que c'est un premier pas.

Jusqu'ici, en tout cas, à moins que je ne me trompe, l'Ouest n'a pas fait d'autres demandes pour un réaménagement constitutionnel. Je pense que c'est un début et il faut un peu de bonne volonté au-delà de ça. Mais je crois que, à travers le pays, à part le Québec, il y a un sentiment très fort dans les Maritimes et un sentiment peut-être moins fort

mais quand même, je crois, majoritaire dans les provinces de l'Ouest pour qu'il y ait un gouvernement central fort.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Merci. Please continue to struggle with this and encourage your students to do so.

Mr Offer: Mr Perin, my question deals with your presentation, talking about Ontario as a pluralistic province and it should take a lead role in that area. You have alluded to, in that respect, the question of Bill 8 and being able to express oneself under Bill 8 through the French language. I am wondering if you might be able to share with us whether you feel that the role of Ontario in the future should be, if not an expansion of Bill 8, then certainly a parallel piece of legislation which incorporates other languages, other than obviously the French language, and whether you feel that this is certainly an underlying right that all Ontarians and in fact Canadians should have and that the right to express oneself in another language is a matter of the numbers, the amount of people in a particular district, as opposed to an inherent right of one particular language over another.

M. Perin : Je crois qu'il faut se rendre à l'évidence qu'il y a beaucoup de groupes linguistiques dans la province et que, s'il fallait offrir des services à tous ces groupes, on n'en finirait pas.

Laissez-moi préfacer mes remarques en disant que je suis fils d'immigrants, alors je fais partie de ce Canada multiculturel, n'est-ce pas ? Donc, j'espère que je n'apporte pas de préjugés dans ce que je dis.

Je crois que si on analyse la réalité sociologique et culturelle des immigrants sur une ou deux ou trois générations, on remarque un affaiblissement de la langue des communautés culturelles. À partir de la deuxième génération, c'est déjà plus que la moitié qui ne parlent plus la langue d'origine. Donc, le processus est très rapide pour les communautés culturelles. Je reconnais que c'est très important.

Par exemple, mon épouse est assistante sociale et elle a travaillé dans un hôpital. Elle a vu que c'est très important, par exemple, pour les personnes âgées qui ne parlent pas l'anglais de recevoir des services dans leur langue dans les hôpitaux parce que c'est quand même une situation très difficile pour les malades. Il y a des services comme ça qu'on devrait offrir. Mais de là à dire qu'il faudrait légiférer ces droits, je crois que c'est tout un pas à franchir parce que, évidemment, ce serait extrêmement compliqué.

Alors, la prémisse de ma présentation est qu'il y a des peuples qui ont des droits historiques dans ce pays et ce sont les autochtones et les francophones. Les autres, on devrait autant que possible offrir des droits linguistiques ou des services dans leur langue mais je ne pense pas qu'on puisse légiférer dans ce domaine-là.

JOHN CRISPO

The Chair: I call John Crispo.

Dr Crispo: The last time I appeared before a select committee in Ontario it seemed to be a happier occasion. I was appearing at the time when the leaders of all three political parties in Ontario were endorsing Meech Lake, and I must say I was extremely proud of them. I thought it

was a historic moment in this province, because while there was opposition to Meech Lake, and it was deep-seated, it seemed to me the three leaders of the parties were rising above it and thinking of Canada as a whole.

Well, that period has passed. I never thought Meech Lake would have solved everything. I did feel it would have bought us time to resolve what I knew were continuing issues. The unfortunate thing is, now we neither have Meech Lake nor time.

I think we have got to the point where there are only two remaining alternatives, and I guess I could be accused of speaking from a Quebec perspective when I say this. I guess I should say that I share the Quebec perspective at this time, although I do not entirely support it. I hope that is not a contradiction.

1120

What are the two alternatives? The first is an asymmetrical Canada, with Quebec having special status. I think we should stop mincing with words like "distinct society." The issue all along has been, are we prepared as a country to give Quebec special status? That would clearly be far beyond Meech Lake. I do not think Canadians ever realized what was happening to them when the media and the opponents of Meech Lake so distorted it and twisted it that it bore no resemblance to what it really was.

It is too late now. It will be far beyond Meech Lake. It would have to fall short of the Allaire report in Quebec, because it goes too far. I do not know precisely what form it would take, but I really believe that unless English Canadians are finally prepared to recognize and put in print what has been an historic reality in this country from the beginning of time, or at least from the beginning of Confederation, that Quebec is the only province that deserves special status because it is the only province that represents one of our three founding peoples. That is what it is all about. It is special. It has its own culture, its own language, its own civil code. It is unique and somehow we are not big enough in English Canada to recognize that.

By now you will begin to recognize that my preferred position is the first choice, the asymmetrical Canada.

The alternative is some bastardized combination of the Belgian language model and the Swiss confederal system. Again, I cannot tell you precisely what form it would take, but I fear that on the Belgium side it would mean a French Quebec, an English rest of Canada and a much-diminished bilingual capital called Ottawa-Hull, or whatever it would be called. On the language side I think it would really mean the end of bilingualism as we have known it. I am not saying there would be no English in Quebec and no French in English Canada, but I think there would be a clear split and bilingualism would only survive in what was left of a capital zone.

As for the reference to the Swiss confederal system, it is hard to believe that any country is more decentralized than we are, but Switzerland is. The Swiss government has virtually no power except in defence and foreign affairs and trade and monetary policy. That is the other alternative, starkly stated, that Ottawa—look at the Allaire report; I suspect similar thinking will be coming out of the Bélanger-Campeau report in Quebec—Ottawa would have

virtually no power and the regions—let's not talk about the provinces, because accompanying this proposal is the notion that we would combine something in the Maritimes and combine something in the west and we would end up four or five regions.

Well, I have made it clear. I would much prefer the first of these two alternatives, but neither one of them is likely to prove acceptable in English Canada, so it does not matter a tinker's dam what I would prefer.

I suppose if we really worked at it we might get one or the other. Again, I hope it would be the first. I am rather dubious. So I think it is time—and I do not want to be unduly pessimistic; there may be better ways of putting it—I think we better begin to think about what may be the inevitable, which is a divorce. I do not want a divorce. I love this country so much and I know without Quebec we would probably not survive. Neither would they. The irony of it all is, if we do come apart, the danger is we will all fall bit by bit into the United States, and Quebec will be committing suicide for us and itself, because it will end up Louisiana north.

If we are going to have a divorce, the question then becomes, how do we go about it? Again, it will be obvious what my choice is. We could do it. We could do it civilly, maturely, responsibly and sensibly. That would obviously be my preference. We could end up with a common market, perhaps a common currency and shared assets and debts and work it all out. That is what I would prefer, if it comes to that.

The alternative is that we become bitter, emotional and irrational, perhaps even worse. I do not want to contemplate. In other words, it is a typical divorce. There is no agreement, there is no consensus, there is a total breakdown. We do not even end up with a common market if it gets too bad. There is nothing left between us.

I have made it clear where I stand on this one. If we are going to get divorced, let's do it amicably. I am frightened we will not. What is my conclusion? The best-case scenario is the one I began with, and that is that we work out a new Canada on an asymmetrical basis, with Quebec having the special status it has always had and always deserved. The second best is a reasonably amicable parting of the ways. I guess beyond these possibilities, I really do not want to think about it. My colleagues have said "Don't speculate about it out loud," so I will not.

I guess my message to you is that Ontario's position could turn out to be critical. I know we are resented all over the country, except perhaps in Quebec, but at this vital time in our history I would love to see some real statesmanship again from Ontario I knew we sought during the Meech Lake accord. I would love to see all three leaders of the parties in Canada come up with an approach that is sensible and all the other words I could use, but I fear for my country as I never have before, because I do not see much goodwill on either side at this stage.

That is really my conclusion. I would add a footnote that only this morning, forgive me, I read over your document which was to help those appearing before you and I am more than prepared to discuss other items with you. Naturally I would love to discuss how we can secure our

future in the international economy. I would of course opt for more liberalized trade and a recognition in Canada that if we do not become competitive it does not matter, again, a tinker's dam what we do. We are in dire straits. But I wanted to concentrate on what I take to be the most immediate and telling challenge that confronts this country, the one that could tear it apart.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Crispo. There are a number of questions and I would like to try to accommodate as many or all of those that we can, but ask people to try to keep their prefaces short. Mr Malkowski first.

Mr Malkowski: I would like to thank you very much for your honesty and your perspective on these issues. You were speaking of the failure of Meech Lake, as well as the Allaire report, in that it is asking too much. We have 18 months left to consider prior to Quebec's decision regarding the Allaire report. Do you think we should give Quebec this special status, and if not, do not follow the Allaire report at all and make revisions to it, or should we just allow Quebec to proceed forth with the separation?

Dr Crispo: Let me begin by saying I am not sure that we have 18 months. I think the die will be cast long before the referendum is taken, because I think attitudes, if they have not already hardened in Quebec, will be hardened. So I do not think we have 18 months.

I have already said I would opt for special status for Quebec. If you want to use the Allaire report as a basis for looking at what special status would entail, let me just give you a very general answer.

I would do everything possible to delegate to Quebec every conceivable power it needs to pursue its legitimate cultural and linguistic needs. On the other hand, I would fight to retain in the hands of the federal government as much as we can in terms of the economic management of the country. That gets dicey when you come to matters such as education and manpower, but that is the split I would make. "We will give you everything you could conceivably ask for to further your special"—and I would say treasured—"cultural and linguistic needs, but do not ask us to give up those things that are essential to drive the national economy of this country."

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much. John, you always speak very clearly. I am glad you are using the word "asymmetrical," I am glad you are talking about divorce, because I think these are words that people understand and we have to keep saying more and more these are the kinds of options that are out there.

We were just getting our first summary today of the hearings we have had in the last two weeks, and the greatest cluster is around Ontario taking a leadership role. You mentioned that very briefly. I would like you to say a little more, if you could, about that and about how this committee could be helpful in that direction.

1130

Dr Crispo: I think you have said it. I do not think you can swallow it. I think this committee would have to say Ontario believes so strongly in this country that it does not want to see it disappear. At the same time, we recognize the legitimate aspirations of Quebec, and particularly its

francophone citizens, and we are prepared to do what should have been done years ago to recognize that Quebec is unique, must have a special status in this country if it is to survive, and we have to stop pretending that any other province has the right to pretend it has anything like the same rights. And if we do not do that, you might as well forget about it; there is going to be divorce.

I do not know how that would be perceived in the rest of Canada. It might be perceived as another Ontario-Quebec axis trying to do something to the rest of the country. That is the risk I think you would have to take, because I think that is what the choice is. Either we come up with an enduring form of special status that we can all live with, or we are not going to work this out.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: So you are suggesting that is one of the committee's recommendations.

Dr Crispo: I would make it the recommendation.

Mr Eves: Mr Crispo, as we have travelled around the province, primarily the northern part of the province, in the previous two weeks, I think it is fair to say that the majority of the people or witnesses who have appeared before the committee have said that they believe in a strong federal government with national standards for national policies stated by the federal government Canada-wide.

You have talked about special status for the province of Quebec, and I guess the question I would have to you is somewhat along the line of questioning that Mrs O'Neill just asked, and that is, are there other things that we in the province of Ontario can do that will sell special status, if that is the way you want to put it, to the rest of Canada? For example, are there unilateral actions that the province of Ontario can make, such as making itself officially bilingual, and any other aspects that you might have thought of that Ontario can do to take the lead? What can we do?

Dr Crispo: I think what I have said in response to the previous question stands. Ultimately I think we have to bite the bullet on this and recognize what the basic issue is. I have not read about or watched all your hearings. I was—I hate to use the word again—frightened by a lot of the things I heard, because I think calling for a strong federal government and a strong united Canada was a way some people found of saying, "There is no way Quebec is going to get anything like what it got in Meech Lake, let alone beyond that." So I think you have to be careful about what they were saying and what they were meaning.

I think we are past the point of gestures. I think, for example, if Ontario now suddenly declared official bilingualism to be its policy in a firmer sense than it has to date, that would not be enough. I think we have gone too far. Somebody said to you there is no crisis. I am not selling books. This is not my field. I just care for my country. I know Peter Russell well and I know what motivates him; it is the same as me. I do not know whether Peter would even call it a crisis. I would call it a crisis.

So I think we are past the stage where we can, I do not want to say grandstand, but I guess I used the word and that is unfair too. If I did not use it, I will use it now, but I do not mean it in the worst sense of it. Tokenism is not going to work any more. We are at the crunch.

Mr Bisson: Mr Crispo, I think you hit the nail on the head. What you are saying is that we are at a point now where there is so much intolerance when it comes to the whole question on both sides of the issue that people are not seeing rationally past this point. I guess my only question to you is, what can we do as politicians and what can we do as citizens in order to get people to start looking at the issue? Because really I think you are right: what happens often is that we lose track of the issue because we are so caught up in the rhetoric. What do we do?

Dr Crispo: You can do what I do and get frustrated. I speak a fair amount around this country and I always try to work this issue in, and what always comes up is Quebec's infamous language bill. Quite frankly, I will never forgive Bourassa for doing what he did not have to do at the wrong time, but I will never forgive English Canadians for their intolerance and lack of understanding.

I do not care what they did with that language bill, Quebec still treats English-speaking people far better than any other province, with the possible exception of New Brunswick, treats French-speaking people. And it does not matter how long or often you say this, that hardly ever gets through in the media. The hysteria gets through, whether it is on one side or the other; what happened in Sault Ste Marie, what happened in—I do not know, where they stomped on the flag. The CBC in Quebec was just unforgivable. They are bad enough nationally, but in Quebec they played that thing day in, day out, as if it was a general phenomenon.

All you can do is go out and try to talk what I think are the facts and to go beyond the facts and ask whether this country is worth recognizing historical reality. That is all I am talking about. I mean, virtually everything I am talking about in Quebec, they have virtually got.

Mr Bisson: So you are saying the media also has a role in putting forward the facts in a way that people can understand them.

Dr Crispo: Do not get me on the media. I will never forget what they did to Meech Lake. The butchered it. I thought Carstairs and Wells owned both The Journal and Canada AM non-stop. The hyenas and jackals are what the media features. They simplify, they sensationalize and they just confuse. Apparently it sells papers and it sells radio and TV time. I just wish we had a law that required equal time, space and prominence for both sides of arguments and required the media, when it attacks a particular group, to give the other side equal time, space and prominence.

Mr Harnick: In what we have been hearing around the province, free trade is something perceived in a very negative way in Ontario. That has been almost the universal approach and delivery to us. Quebec was probably the most ardent booster of free trade. How do we reconcile, in terms of what Ontario is going to be doing, the position that workers in this province feel with what economically is still perceived as a plus in Quebec?

Dr Crispo: If anything gets me worked up more than the media, it is free trade.

Mr Harnick: I figured we might get some answers.

Dr Crispo: In part because of the media, because if you think they were bad on Meech Lake, they just campaigned

against free trade, and they still are. They are publishing the big lie I guess it is: "CLC says 200,000 jobs lost due to free trade." That is a complete crock. The media now repeats it as if it is fact, so it is going to be very difficult. Let me tell you what the problem is.

Mr Harnick: Sort us out.

Dr Crispo: I will tell you what the problem is.

Interjection: In two hours?

Dr Crispo: No, no, I do not need two hours. I just need a couple of seconds. Canadians want to shoot the messenger. They do not want to receive the message. The messenger is the free trade agreement. It is saying, "You're not competitive." We do not want to hear that because that means what we said all along, that free trade was not a panacea, it was an opportunity and it is up to us to take advantage of it—if we choose to so mismanage our own internal affairs at all levels of government that we are not competitive any more, it is no use branding free trade, either with the US or hopefully with Mexico. It is up to Canadians to get competitive.

That is not the question you asked me, but you have provoked me. I understand what you are saying. People in Ontario are saying, "Well, we were against free trade and those rascals down in Quebec were for it, and that is one more reason why we should not pay any attention to historical reality." I do not know what you do with that.

I do not want to offend my old friend and teaching assistant Bob Rae, but he is still on the old record, he is against all trade. He calls it free trade, but he is against all trade, and Quebec is for all trade. I am on their side and I am against Ontario's position, but as long as Ontario takes this position and Quebec takes that position, it is something anybody can exploit if he wants to.

What am I going to do? I have tried to change Ontario. I had trouble with the previous Premier, I have trouble with this Premier—

Mr Bisson: Keep on trying.

Dr Crispo: —and I keep on trying.

The Chair: Okay, I think we will end there. Thank you, Dr Crispo, for your candour.

Dr Crispo: Leaving me in trouble with all premiers.

Mr Bisson: I think you should run for the job.

The Chair: An appropriate ending to the presentation.

1140

GEORGE FORSTER

The Chair: I call George Forster.

Mr Forster: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, my name is George Forster. I live in Toronto. I have also lived in and worked in Regina, Montreal and Halifax. I am semiretired and I still work on a part-time basis as a tax and financial planning consultant, and I look forward to seeing you all at the hearings on fair taxation shortly.

My great love is really the study of Canadian history. I am at a disadvantage this morning because, first of all, Professor Crispo is always a hard act to follow and, second, because somehow or other he seems to have got hold of my presentation and been reading it because—and this is

probably the first time this has happened—he and I agree on 90% of everything he said.

It seems to me, though, the issue facing us is an emotional issue. I have been travelling intensively for the last year or so, and every time I go somewhere in Europe somebody says, “You’re a Canadian,” and they say: “What are you people doing? You’re crazy. You’ve got probably the best place in the whole world to live and you’re determined to destroy it.”

If we were determined to destroy this country, have we left anything out? Can you think of anything we should have done that would have speeded up the process? Why are we doing this to each other? We are doing this, in my opinion, because we do not understand our history. We do not teach history very well in the schools, and if we examine our history, we will see that we are still carrying around the baggage of the disputes that took place 100 years ago. What is at the core of it, I am sorry to say, is that there is a streak of religious and linguistic bigotry running all through our past. We like to think of ourselves as kind, friendly, caring, compassionate people, and there is some truth in that, but there is also a substantial element of hypocrisy in that.

A few months ago, do you remember seeing in the papers the federal government announced it was going to give \$15 million to South Africa to improve the education of black children? At the same time, we were cutting back on grants for the education of Indian and Eskimo children. We criticize the Soviet Union for its treatment of its minorities. Are we happy about the way we have treated our minorities? How many people have ever seen an Indian reservation? Have you people? Did you get a chance to see a reservation on your trip in the north?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: We will this week.

Mr Forster: Were you proud of it?

When we look at the bigotry that I spoke of, we see that there are faults on both sides, but on balance I believe that French-speaking Canadians have been treated as second-class citizens for nearly 200 years and it is time we stopped and recognized that. That is why more and more of them are telling us that they have had enough and unless things change, they are prepared to go it alone, regardless of the economic consequences.

There is no point in handing them \$50 million for a cultural research centre in Montreal. Obviously they are going to be happy to take the money, but it is not a financial or an economic issue. They know their taxes are higher than most every other province and they are prepared to pay the price, if that is what is necessary, to retain their culture, in exactly the same way you and I are willing to pay higher taxes to live in Canada rather than move south.

Our schools teach history very badly and we do not really understand what has actually been going on for the last 150 years. How many of you, for example, have ever heard of D'Alton McCarthy or Honoré Mercier or Joseph-Israel Tarte or Sam Hughes? Each one of these people did his best to drive one more nail in the coffin and we do not even know what they were arguing about, and yet we are

still paying the penalty of arguments that if we looked at now we would be ashamed of and horrified that people actually said these things.

I would like to review that with you. After the conquest in 1761 there were something like 60,000 colonists and they were told by General Murray that King George III would confirm “communities and individuals in possession of their property, their laws and their customs.” All they had to do was put down their arms. They did. Mind you, remember that these colonists had been completely abandoned by France. France refused to honour their paper money, so a lot of them were bankrupt. In the peace talks, France said it would be quite happy to give up Canada as long as it could keep Guadeloupe and access to the fisheries. The colonists had no support but their history, their language, their customs and their religion.

Some 65 years later, a new Governor of Canada, the Earl of Durham, described Canada as, “Two nations warring in the bosom of a single state.” I would like to detour for a minute. Notice the way he said “nations” and “state.” There were two nations quarrelling in the bosom of a single state. “Every contest is one of French and English at the outset, or become so ere it has run its course.” His solution was to merge Upper Canada and Lower Canada in the expectation that the English-speaking majority would swamp the French-speaking minority. The union took place, but the French-speaking minority was no more willing to give up its history and its language than my great-great-grandfather was willing to give up his allegiance to Britain and the crown when he came to Canada in 1774 as a refugee from the rebellious colonies.

The union of the two colonies came in 1840. One of the consequences of the union was that it gave the Catholic minority in Upper Canada the political strength to demand Catholic schools, just as the English-speaking Protestants of Lower Canada had already been given English-language schools. When we get into this delicate area, I would just like to say as a matter of record that I happen to have grown up in a Protestant home. My attendance at church is perhaps once every three or four years. I personally wish we had a secular school system in this province, but that is beside the point and I am not prepared to start a war over it.

If we look, for example, at the letters of Egerton Ryerson, who was superintendent of education for Ontario, you will find a letter to a school board in 1857 saying, “As French is the recognized language of the country, as well as English, it is quite proper and lawful for the trustees to allow both languages to be taught in their school to children whose parents may desire them to learn both.” That is pretty clear, pretty straightforward and certainly well in conformity with what General Murray promised 100 years before that.

But over the next 50 years a stream of new regulations restricted the teaching of French in Ontario. This was a language issue, you understand, not a religious issue, because in 1910 the Catholic Bishop of London declared that he wanted “to wipe out every vestige of bilingual teaching in the schools of this diocese.” By 1912, English-speaking Catholics and English-speaking Protestants joined together

and forced through new regulations which virtually prohibited the teaching of French in Ontario.

Manitoba had an even more bitter dispute. When Manitoba became part of Canada, French and English became the official languages of the province and there was to be public funding for both French and English schools. But then there started a vicious anti-French campaign implemented by something called the Equal Rights Association. I think we have one of those still, do we not? Did you not encounter one of these the other day, the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada? I wish they had been talking about syntax, but that is a separate issue. I am sorry.

There was a vicious anti-French campaign implemented by the Equal Rights Association headed by D'Alton McCarthy. He was a staunch Ontario Orangeman and a member of Parliament. I will not go into all the details, but there were six or seven years of cases going to the Privy Council in England, elections being run on the issue, and the ultimate end was that by 1896 French schools were a thing of the past in Manitoba.

Naturally, there was an immediate reaction in Quebec and a new political party emerged, le Parti national, led by Honoré Mercier, and he won the next election. Should we be surprised at that? His campaign platform was pretty simple. He said, "If they can break their promises in Manitoba, they can break their promises in Quebec." One of his first acts was to call a convention of provincial premiers to demand more power from the federal government and more revenue from the federal government. Is it not amazing, *plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

You can find the same kind of anger and bitterness in many issues, all of which have a racial and linguistic and religious component: issues like conscription, and it had that too, but I will not go into that; the issue of whether Canada is going to continue to be part of our glorious Empire or whether it is going to be an independent state, etc.

1150

There were always hotheads in Quebec ready to hit back at the hotheads in Ontario, and these people always represented a minority. If you read what these people said and if you study what they did—and a good deal of it was in the media; the media then was just as rapacious and just as eager for a headline and never to let the facts interfere with a good story as they are today—you will find it difficult to understand their excitement over issues which seem to us today of absolutely no importance whatsoever. But it has set up this climate of anger and bitterness that we are paying the penalty for today. Ask yourselves, why did the silent minority permit this to happen and why are we carrying this bitterness and venom around still on our shoulders?

Now our forefathers did many things that we can be proud of and many things we wish they had not done, but we should not be perpetuating the errors of the past. If we can apologize to the Japanese Canadians and the Italian Canadians, I suggest we can also say to our friends in Quebec that a lot of things happened that we are sorry for and that we are ashamed of. That is essentially what I want

to say. I just want to add two or three things, if I still have time, relating to what Ontario should be doing.

1. I agree with Professor Crispo wholeheartedly that we need some economic realism for a change. For years we have been more concerned with the distribution of wealth than with the creation of wealth, and we seem to have overlooked the fact that the world has changed. From an economic point of view, the world has changed far more dramatically than anything we have seen since the Industrial Revolution 200 years ago.

We still go on rewarding failure and penalizing success. We will bail out a losing company no matter how inept its management or how rapacious its employees. But we refuse to create a climate in which winners can flourish and create more wealth. To attract jobs, we need a climate that encourages investment and an infrastructure and a skilled workforce. Unless we can do that, our standard of living is in jeopardy.

2. Obviously we need major constitutional change. One of the things that I suggest we need to do is to eliminate or reduce the overlaps and duplications in government. For example, let's look at Metropolitan Toronto. We have six municipalities and then a major municipality. Then we have the department and the municipal board and an assistant deputy minister looking after the Golden Horseshoe, and we have seven planning departments, seven parks departments, seven school boards. Ottawa is even worse. You have got the National Capital Commission to deal with as well as all these things.

The art of government now seems to be to maximize transfer payments from you to me, while I can pass along costs from me to you. In order to do this thing, to juggle transfer payments, we need a new department with a new minister, a new deputy minister and a communications department to tell the world what a wonderful job we are doing.

3. We need enormous amounts of research. We cannot compete with developing countries in labour-intensive industries like clothing. We can only compete with value-added industries, like fibre optics, communications, robotics, etc. Our educational system and our job creation system has not kept up with that.

4. While I admire very much, having watched you on the tube for a week, your patience and your dedication, we also need legislators we can respect. Have you ever seen yourselves on TV during question period? Have you ever watched the House of Commons during question period? I am not talking about the Senate. I do not even want to think about the Senate, much less talk about it. You could behave like that when no one was looking, but now people are seeing what goes on in question period. I would like my grandchildren to respect you and they do not.

5. When we do start to rewrite the Constitution, let's not do it in front of the camera. The negotiations will be difficult and complex enough, but it cannot happen as long as the participants are spending half their time mugging at the camera for the folks back home.

6. Finally, I would like very much, because this is an emotional issue for the province of Ontario, to take the first step in making our peace with the people of Quebec,

because a lot of the emotional and bigotry nonsense started in Ontario. Quebec is no longer willing to be in Canada if the Constitution permits other provinces to threaten its language and culture. It is as simple as that. I am suggesting that we take the first step to make sure the people of Quebec understand that we understand their problems and that we are in sympathy with their aspirations. It is as important to us to maintain French-language culture as it is to them.

For example, I would dearly love to see a float from the province of Ontario in the Saint-Jean-Baptiste parade next summer. Even better, I would like to see it selling not tourism but understanding. I would like to see the Premier on that float and I would like to see that float with a big sign on it, saying, "It is easier to patch up a shaky marriage than to go through the agony, the bitterness and the appalling cost of the divorce."

Have you all seen *The War of the Roses*? I think you should. I think you should get a hold of it and see it. Here was a family who had everything going for it: all kinds of money, a wonderful home, good jobs, kids off to Harvard. They started quarrelling about something or other. They could even remember what it was. They wound up killing each other, beating each other to death with the furniture, and the last thing they did before they died, they reached out, grasped each other's hands and said, "I love you."

I believe that most French Canadians—pardon me, I hate that term; I hate that term and I hate the term "English Canadians." What I meant to say was French-speaking Canadians and English-speaking Canadians. I believe that most French-speaking Canadians love this country and want to be part of it.

I can remember 20 years ago standing in front of Lake Louise talking to a couple of young women from Quebec, who looked up at the glacier and said, "Isn't this a wonderful country?" Last summer I was on Parliament Hill watching a French-speaking family watch the Governor General's footguards changing the guard, and as they went past, here was a little boy about nine years old said, "Notre drapeau." That is the best, all I could understand of his French.

I am not talking about surrender or capitulation, but I am amazed to see out in the streets people with signs and banners saying, "We should negotiate with Saddam Hussein." Where are all the people out on the streets saying, "We want reconciliation with Quebec and we recognize that part of it has been our fault?"

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Forster. Do you have a copy of the presentation?

Mr Forster: Yes.

The Chair: Good. Thank you.

STAN MATIAS

The Chair: We will carry on with the next presenter, Stan Matias.

Mr Matias: Mr Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee, you have an unusual animal in front of you, neither Indian, French or English. I am Polish. I elected this country 38 years ago after being in the RAF for some eight years during the war. I have three children, six grandchildren. This country is in trouble.

I am afraid that the words that were spoken by John F. Kennedy at his inauguration in January on the steps of the Capitol we do not hear any more. I am pro-French. I am pro-Italian. I am pro-Indian. I am pro-English. But then I am Canadian at the most and my children are Canadians and we are very proud of this country. I hate to see this country disintegrate. You could assign some of these problems that we are facing in this country to our parliaments who have done things that really should not have been done. I will give you examples: Manitoba, service of CF-18s. You cannot govern the country and appear to favour one province against another. That would be the same as if you would favour your own children at home and you would create jealousy and resentment. This is what we have.

1200

We unfortunately have a government that is not considering people. I do not know why we have this government now, because from February of 1953 I have always found that the government was responsive to the people. Today I see that laws are made for the lawyers by the lawyers and not for the people. I understand this and I am mad as hell, because I am 71 years old but my grandchildren are aged from 6 to 21 and that hurts their country.

I tried to do best I could. I moved from England because of religious resentment, although I was born a Catholic, I was a non-practising one, but my mother-in-law was resentful of me so I had to find a new country. I made two applications, one to New Zealand, one to Canada. New Zealand told me that because I was born in Poland I would not qualify to go to New Zealand, and I have not eaten lamb since. Canada was generous enough to offer me their doors and I came here to this country and I enjoyed every bit of it, from washing cars at 25 cents an hour to loading trains at CPR for \$236 a month. My wife worked at Eaton's for \$30, my children delivered the *Toronto Star*, and we all did all right without any help. I did not know there was any welfare assistance. I did not know anything about anybody. I just knew that I had to work 16 or 18 hours, whatever it takes, in order to provide welfare for my family. Our unit is very, very close, and I wish that we in Canada would be just as close.

I have nothing against the French being determined to live in their own home with their own dignity, with their own traditions. There is nothing unusual in that. I wish that my children spoke 16 languages. I tried to speak at least three or four. I do not resent teaching our children to speak French. I wish they all spoke French because if we could communicate, we would have a better country for all of us.

I am appealing to this assembly here to do the best that you can, and I can tell you how to do it. We should produce model from Switzerland. We should reduce the powers of our federal government. Each province should collect taxes and let the government produce to you their needs for the money. We will dish out to them whatever they require per capita, so they cannot waste money. Because I hear that we owe \$16,000 per head. I never had a penny. My children did not have a penny. Where did the money go, \$16,000 per head in this country?

You speak of free trade; Mr Crispo spoke about free trade. I am all for free trade, but have the same interest rate

as the United States. That is not an even table. If you want to compete with somebody, your capital has to be at the same value as the fellow borrowing next door to you. If they are borrowing at 9% and we put into our industry at 14%, how the hell can we compete because we have five points against us already? Where is the competition? It does not matter how genius we are in producing free trade. We cannot compete on even basis.

I am all for restraining our federal government. I think we have enough governments. I will give you the example of four provinces in east, hardly two and a half million people, as large as Toronto. They have four governments and all the municipal governments. How many governments can we have? Who is going to bring the bread home? This is going far too far and I think that our problems stem from economic discouragement, because we do not have the opportunity to create wealth so we could pass it on to our children. I think the governments have neglected their responsibility to a very large extent. I am absolving this new government, because I know Bob Rae has not had time yet to adjust things, but I think he could adjust it by providing an even field of taxation. I do not want to see federal and provincial governments getting tax-free money. Pay yourself what you are entitled to, but pay tax the way I do. I consider this to be a privilege, to pay tax. The country is good to me; I want to pay my tax. I do not want to see lords and us; I want to see all of us being equal. This is what I want to see in this country. If you see that I am mad, I am bloody mad—pardon my language. I am mad.

I do not want to see this country going through divorce. I have been married 50 years. I do not know what divorce means; I do not want to see it. I want to see the country united. I am appealing to you to do the best you can.

The Chair: Are there any questions? Thank you very much for your presentation to us.

HANS MODLICH

The Chair: I call our last speaker for this morning, Hans Modlich.

Mr Modlich: I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you. I welcome this opportunity. I speak from the political perspective of a 30-year rank-and-filer in the New Democratic Party. Marilyn Churley will remember my passionate plea for Meech Lake at the federal leadership convention of the party. Bob Rae, of course, made a similar appeal, much more eloquently than I, but I must lament the conspicuous omission of our former national leader in doing the same.

My personal background is that of a self-employed businessman at the present time. I have been a salesman for 10 years in industrial automation. I have worked for the man who brought the chip into Canada, to put it bluntly. I am a trilingual person, of German origin but fluent in English and German and to a lesser extent in French. I am in fact officially a francophone Canadian. I chose to take my citizenship in French. I lived five years in Quebec, during the referendum period. I must say I never felt any hostility towards my background. I am also half Swiss, to echo John Crispo's concerns, and would like to point out to you

that Switzerland is, with its formula of federalism, commemorating 700 years of federation this year.

My objective is to join those who are calling for a reasoned and constructive approach that recognizes the reality and the legitimacy of the present mood in Quebec for sovereignty. I would like to echo, for instance, the call by Ken Bolton made to you in Sioux Lookout, and many people today, for an "amicable divorce"—I personally would call it an amicable separation—people such as Reg Whitaker, Roger Gibbons, academics, and of course John Crispo.

My premise to you is that for 135 years Confederation has been singularly designed to obscure and obliterate the fact that Quebec is a nation unto itself. This marriage contract, Confederation, is now on the rocks. The only substantive intercourse left is that on an economic plane. Quebec is set on the road to sovereignty. I read an excellent article this morning in the *Globe and Mail* about why Quebec will wait no longer, Michel Sarra-Bournet, Carleton University.

Federalist renewal formulas have exhausted their credibility and will only worsen the backlash in English Canada. My advice as a multinational marriage counsellor—self-appointed—is let's have a sombre, sober, but still amicable separation agreement instead of an acrimonious, jingoistic brawl of a divorce. Let's not launch yet another federal offensive as launched by Mulroney, Chrétien and lately chimed in by Wells, now that he is on side via Hibernia.

Let's do what Gorbachev will not do in the Baltic; let's recognize the right of Quebec as a nation to determine its own future inside or outside of Canada, and recognize also that Confederation has had an enormously disrupting effect on English Canada and it is now English Canada's round. It is now our turn to put our own house in order.

1210

I go further. I claim that only the NDP is capable of leading English Canada through such a decade of national reconciliation and healing.

We must reassert our own values, not the American values. We must adopt policies of independence and social reconstruction, not of Reaganomics. Only such a renewed Canada might entice Quebec for a possible partnership in the year 2000.

My 10-point program for a renewed English Canada: I will obviously echo calls I have heard this morning for a streamlined government. We are overgoverned. I cannot afford five levels of government. I cannot afford a Senate, for that matter, and I cannot afford that one arm of government does not know what the other one is doing. A statistic I ran across: in Quebec, in 1975, with six million people it had as many civil servants as California with 23 million.

My second point is that we must equalize by population the size of the federated units. We can do that in two ways. We can either consolidate roughly into regions of equal size—maritime unions and prairie unions have been talked about. We can, on the other hand, break up Ontario into a greater Toronto area, eastern, northern, western. Northern Ontario will probably echo that sentiment. I would like to point out to you that Berlin is a province in the new federated Germany. Why could the greater Toronto

area not be treated as such? That would greatly lend itself to streamlining the excessive number of levels of government.

We must eliminate the overlapping federal jurisdictions. In health I have no quarrel with each province deciding how much to spend on medicare. In fact, I would contest that we need to return to the original—I think it was Swift Current, Saskatchewan—medicare model pioneered under Tommy Douglas's government. Women will do just fine without being criminalized for the right to exercise their choice of procreation.

Pensions: My main concern is that the plan does not go broke. I do not so much care where it comes from.

Media: Why not give each region its own autonomy? I just learned the other day that Germany leaves the jurisdiction for the media at the provincial level, and Germany has not disintegrated. In fact, I find the coverage of the Gulf war crisis in Germany much more objective than here.

First nations need local self-government, not a patronizing Ottawa whose mandarins consume half of the tax dollars.

My fourth point is that we do it democratically. Alienation from government and politicians is so deep that it will take a long time to activate real grass-roots participation. Constituent assemblies, assemblies such as these, will come out.

I am struck by the almost consensus and the quality of contributions you are hearing today. It is not echoed by what I read in the press. For an open government it is absolutely mandatory that you admit mistakes and correct them.

Mechanisms for accountability is my fifth concern. We have right now a Prime Minister with the biggest majority ever in the House and the lowest popularity in the polls. Why not incorporate impeachment and recall powers in the new Canada? Government by referendum, not by behind-the-scenes lobbies. Referendums, by the way, have stood the Swiss confederation in good stead for 700 years. It would not hurt for us to have had referendums, even a referendum that might have reintroduced briefly capital punishment. I personally was very concerned when three parties in Ontario took it upon themselves to pass Bill 30 without recourse to the polls.

We need a fairer taxation system. The book on that subject has been written by Linda McQuaig, called *Behind Closed Doors*, or *How the Rich Won Control of Canada's Tax System and Ended Up Richer*. We need a tax agenda that is not made in Washington.

Similarly, we need to heal the rift on trade policy. To some extent the earlier discussion with John Crispo hinted at the disparity between Quebec's and Canada's view on that subject. We must also, while we favour and recognize the essential need for multinational corporations such as Northern Telecom, demand loyalty on the part of big business to invest in Canada the profits it has earned in Canada.

We must heal the rift and the backlash against Quebec. Two speakers, John Crispo, everyone has addressed this concern. Clean up the mistakes like the CF-18 maintenance contract award. We cannot afford any more Trudeau-era arrogance and abuse of powers.

Bilingualism must come from self-motivation, not by decree. We must accord the Franco-Ontarian the same education rights as the English minority enjoys in Quebec. We must teach a candid understanding of the historic wrongs that have been committed against Quebec. People already have mentioned the banning of French instruction in Manitoba; similarly, regulation 17 in Ontario in 1912; the ceding of Labrador by Westminster in 1927. Most recently, in all our memories, we must apologize to Quebec for perpetrating the big lie of the "apprehended insurrection."

We need a made-in-Canada foreign policy. We need an end to Canadian complicity in the exploitation of the Third World.

And that brings me to my last point. At the highest level of government, we need to reform the United Nations charter itself to inscribe in it the right of self-determination of national minorities to determine their own future, and that should be incorporated in the charter. We must reassert the powers of the general assembly, which is being bypassed in this current crisis. Canada can play an exemplary role in the conflict resolution right on our own doorstep with Quebec. We can then go on and challenge Russia, Israel and Iraq to all do the same. My concern is that the unresolved national questions are the biggest threat to peace both in Canada and the world as a whole.

We must settle with the west coast Indians the first nations land claims. Whose hydro is it in Labrador? What about the Dene, Inuit nations, Mr Wells? Whose golf course is it in Oka? Whose oil is it in Kuwait? Is it the First World's or the Third World's?

I have enclosed a scrapbook in the back of my presentation which contains a number of articles on that subject. One of them is, for instance, an excerpt, and I apologize I did not get to translate it, from the German newspaper, *Die Zeit*. That really raises some penetrating questions. When was the emir's family compact last elected? How can we have been so hoodwinked about a war that is so blatantly a colonial war for control of oil? Do we not believe that Canadian oil should belong to Canadians? Mr Bush, what you are doing to Baghdad is not my idea of a kinder, gentler America. The USA may win militarily but it can only lose politically, and I predict that this war will be the Suez of America and Bush will become another Anthony Eden.

We are still today on the verge of a Third World War, of a holocaust that will involve Israel, then Iran and, through Georgia, possibly Russia. We are not out of the woods yet. Still, we have not even had a debate in our own Parliament on this new offensive posture of our own forces. I oppose the abuse and the exceeding of the UN mandate to do a so-called liberation of Kuwait.

It is indeed the responsibility of social democrats to speak out for peace. A virtually unreported event in the western media was on 12 January of this year: 100,000 East Berliners commemorated the murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht 71 years ago. Those people, for anybody's information, were leading opponents of the First World War and the German Social Democratic Party.

Dare we imagine this century had the Social Democratic Party of Germany in 1914 voted to oppose the war

reparations to the kaiser? Instead, tragically it succumbed to an orgy of jingoism unleashed by the kaiser.

I would like to summarize. I would like to appeal to you to understand what a crucial role and responsibility befalls Ontario's first NDP government to shape what remains of this century and above all to shape the next century.

There is no justification for waiting for better economic times; the issues here are principles, not dollars. We must put basic, fundamental democratic principles first. It is tragic that such a cruel war is needed to remind us how precarious is our planet's peace and democracy. While cholera rages in Peru, famine in Ethiopia, the USA has the nerve to spend a billion bucks a day to topple a dictator. What we have, in essence, is a war by the First World against the aspirations of the Third World.

I want to end with a personal appeal to Bob Rae: practise at home what you have been doing abroad, ie, your visit less than a year ago to Lithuania. Go to Quebec just as you went to Vilnius and state that you respect the right of Quebec to self-determination. Invite the Quebec nation

to postpone a divorce, to give English Canada a separation agreement and a decade of reprieve to adjust itself and its forms of government.

The logical corollary of this on a world plane is a plea to Stephen Lewis to speak out against the unwarranted abuse of the US mandate by Bush, to take steps to convene a UN general assembly, to work with other like-minded social democrats, such as Willy Brandt and the federal NDP caucus, to reform the UN charter on this very vital issue.

Thank you for your time.

The Chair: Are there questions? Thank you very much for your presentation.

That concludes the morning session for the committee. We will recess until 2 o'clock. I would ask members to be back here so we can start promptly at 2 o'clock because we do have a full afternoon.

The committee recessed at 1222.

AFTERNOON SITTING

The committee resumed at 1412.

The Chair: I call this afternoon's session to order. This is the continuation of the hearings in Toronto of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are sitting here in Toronto at the Legislative Building hearing from individuals and organizations.

I want to apologize for our starting late. We had a meeting of the subcommittee. For the members of the committee, we will have a report later on which will deal with some organizational matters, particularly when we are back in Toronto at the end of next week and with respect to 1 March as well. We have said before that we might reserve that as an additional day and the subcommittee is recommending that we use that, given the number of groups and individuals who are on the list to try to speak to us here in Toronto. But we can deal with the logistics of that later in the afternoon or in this evening's sitting.

MRS EDWARD RYAN

The Chair: I will resume with the list of speakers for this afternoon and call Ed Ryan to come forward.

Mrs Ryan: I am Mrs Ryan. Mr Ryan is working but I have his presentation.

The Chair: That is fine. Could I just say to you and to all of the others who are here who will be presenting that we have allotted a 15-minute time span and a 30-minute time span, 15 minutes for individuals, 30 minutes for organizations. We would really appreciate it if people keep their presentation to below that time because then that will allow us some time for questions. We are not going to be able to add more time to that because we actually do have a couple of individuals or groups who might be added to the list at the end of the afternoon session. It really would be useful for us to have a bit of time within those time frames to have some questions and discussion back and forth.

With that, Mrs Ryan, go ahead.

Mrs Ryan: Right at the beginning I wish to direct my remarks to you and my compatriots in Quebec; also, perhaps, francophones living outside Quebec will be interested. You Québécois have an obligation to be part of Canada for years and years. At present 25% of the Canadians who speak French live outside Quebec and rely on Quebec as an area near their homes here in North America where we communicate in French and also receive newspapers, novels and school books, as well as other correspondence referring to advanced education like medicine, commerce and accounting, etc.

This correspondence in French that we receive from Quebec is very important to those of us who speak French as a second or third language as it is well adapted to North American use.

The Canada for which I gave six years of my youth and for which my brother gave his life does not function as a nation, but acts like several groups of bickering and angry humans causing harm to each other in any way possible.

The cause of this dissatisfaction in Canada is the arrogant, cruel and destructive attitude of most elected representatives and senior government employees. This includes federal, provincial and municipal. Anyone who opposes any elected representative can expect harsh treatment, discrimination and destruction of property. Getting elected at all costs or having an erroneous or unethical endeavour succeed generally brings severe hardship on Canadians, especially those who speak French mainly as a second or third language or whose race is not what the local government representative recognized as serving this nation to his or her liking.

I was a victim of one of those arrogant acts by a senior employee of CN Rail, J. P. Schiller. A large building I owned where seven people earned a livelihood was destroyed. I, the owner, or any other human did not receive any compensation, support or assistance from any level of government. The land this building occupied has been vacant for over 21 years. The loss to all levels of government in New Brunswick where I was born and lived over half my life and where my building was located was over \$250,000. J. McMillan, a prominent Toronto resident and member of the NDP stated in this very room on 14 June 1990, "Mr Ryan was robbed, not by the government but by the man who is in charge of the CNR," a crown corporation.

Until claims that so many Canadians have against all governments of Canada and their crown corporations and their employees are settled, liberty and unity in Canada will not exist.

Final word on what the future of Canada, if Canada can be saved, should be: Five regions: Atlantic provinces, Quebec and Labrador, Ontario, prairie provinces, British Columbia and Yukon; Northwest Territories to be governed by the federal government for the present. All transportation should be controlled by the regions so that the hauling of BC salmon to the fish-rich area of eastern New Brunswick, which included the Miramichi River, noted for its salmon, and hauling canned vegetables from Ontario to the rich farm areas of Alberta or plywood from BC to the lumber camps of Quebec can be stopped. The reason for this unethical hauling is to create freight for government-owned railways.

A unilingual country will not operate very effectively in the 21st century, so I propose that all Canadian products be labelled, have handling and assembly instructions, contents, etc, in the following four languages of our neighbours and fellow Canadians: Spanish, English, French and Portuguese, and perhaps a language from Asia.

Asking that you intercede for me and many more Canadians to have our claims settled with the federal or any government in Canada, Edward Ryan.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs Ryan.

L. J. REDMAN

The Chair: I call L. J. Redman.

Mr Redman: I have prepared for actually 10 minutes. I was called and told it would be 10. I prepared for eight,

so I definitely will not run over. I have chosen to speak on Canadian unity as a part of Ontario in Confederation. The very existence of this select committee on Ontario in Confederation, and also the federal Citizens' Forum on Canada's Future, tells us that our national unity is faced with a serious challenge, the most serious challenge since Confederation. In the time I have available I am going to touch on points that I consider to be of paramount importance to Canadian unity. These points apply both to the provincial and the federal domain.

I apologize if I move on the fed scene a little because I know this is a provincial committee, but they overlap so, as you well know; it is not possible to keep them apart. We must identify our problems and deal with them realistically.

First, we must all be Canadians. Our origins are important to each one of us, and rightly so, but first and above all we must be Canadians. Without virtually all Canadians having this as a firm conviction, our country cannot remain united in its present form. That Canadians lack a feeling of Canadian identity is not surprising. Our federal census form does not have a single question which can be answered by the word "Canadian." Regardless of the reason behind this, it can only serve to confuse and divide us and to increase our lack of Canadian identity.

1420

I was born and raised in Ontario. I am, generally speaking, pleased and happy to live here, but when I think of myself as an Ontarian, I do not feel that deep sense of pride that I feel, and have always felt, when I identify myself as a Canadian. I am a Canadian.

Multiculturalism, however well intended, has become a dividing force in our nation. People from other countries seem to be encouraged to bring their countries' problems with them, and these problems disrupt our national fabric. Multiculturalism is a fact of Canadian life, but we emphasize it too much and it divides us. Self-serving political parties and politicians have used multicultural programs to obtain votes and this increases our lack of identity. We must all stand and be counted as Canadians.

The next point I raise is fairness. Fair and equal treatment must be given to all Canadians in all parts of Canada. We in Ontario must ensure that our federal government follows this mandate. The unfair treatment of Winnipeg in the CF-18 overhaul program, awarded to a Montreal company with a bid \$100-million-plus higher than the Winnipeg bid, is a flagrant example of federal waste and favouritism, and this will not be forgotten by Manitobans.

The movement of our space centre from Ottawa to Montreal, where almost a third of a billion dollars will be spent, some of it to duplicate facilities already in existence and in use by the space centre when it was in Ottawa, where it should have remained, will unfairly take contracts and jobs from our Ontario aerospace industry. There is the movement of our National Archives from Ottawa to Gatineau, and the recent quiet announcement last week by the office of Marcel Masse that a Canadian cultural centre will be built in Montreal at a cost of \$45 million, and on and on it goes.

This is not fair treatment and provincial governments and citizens must speak out against it. Also, should Quebec

separate, these facilities, paid for by the Canadian taxpayer, will no longer be in Canada.

I now raise the point of openness in government. Meech Lake was conceived in a cloak of secrecy between the Prime Minister and premiers, and when new premiers became involved and when they found out what Meech really said, they rejected it. Had it been a more open forum, perhaps it might have succeeded. We will never know.

We must respect the democratic process. The will of the majority must be sought out and served, not the will of a select few and of vocal self-interest groups, but of that over 70% of our population so often called the silent majority. I do not suggest that we govern by referendum, but some issues could best be decided by this method. I refer specifically to Ontario's Bill 8.

In conclusion, the process, as it has been used or, more correctly, misused in the past has brought us to where we are today. I am encouraged by the fact that this committee has been created. If we do turn to an unselfish use of democracy for all Canadians and to fair and evenhanded fiscal policies for all, by both our federal and provincial governments, and if we as citizens recognize and take our places as proud and responsible Canadians in our great country, perhaps Canada, as we know it, will endure.

The Chair: Mr Redman, there are a couple of questions if you are prepared to take them.

Mr Offer: My question, Mr Redman, deals with your part of the submission on the issue of referendums, and specifically on an issue such as Bill 8. Do you find that the use of referendums might be at the very best an inappropriate vehicle when you are dealing with the protection of minority interests? Do you not feel that maybe it is the obligation and responsibility of elected officials to stand up and say what they feel and believe and to vote accordingly, and maybe to be held accountable in the next election as opposed to putting the issue of any minority interest by referendum?

Mr Redman: I go back to democracy as I see it, and democracy is really quite a simple process. Unfortunately we in Canada always seem to have to go to another country to get examples of it, but Abraham Lincoln summed it up as "for the people, of the people, by the people"—I cannot remember the order. I do know that to get the will of, as I mentioned, the silent majority, I think is a good thing. That referendums be used as a regular tool of government, I do not agree with, no, but I do cite Bill 8 as one that I would like to have been able to make comment on.

I do not disagree with Bill 8. The fact that what it requires, and that is service to the French community, that it is there, is made available, is right considering the fact that we are a bilingual nation. I am not going to go into detail, but I have spoken to Mr Beer about this. However, there are examples of waste in that. You know of it as well as I do. I like common sense in things and I think possibly the use of a referendum, not to decide the fact that the issue will be passed or not passed but to get opinion on it, is worth while.

Mr Bisson: You said in the presentation that one of the things we need to do is identify ourselves as being Canadian. I agree with that premise. To a certain point, one of the things we have been hearing quite a bit from people who have been making presentations is the sense of pride they have when they travel abroad and are identified as Canadian. They travel to Europe or other places, and there seems to be this sense that Canada is not a bad place, is a fairly tolerant society that stands up for some pretty decent things.

Do you not think that by going in the direction I think you are implying with regard to deciding things by referendum, such as Bill 8, throwing things like Bill 8 out or not recognizing the distinctiveness of Quebec or whatever, we would have turned our back on all of that? Do you not think that would be detrimental to Canada as a whole and also in the way it would be seen by other nations?

Mr Redman: Myself I feel that as to how we are perceived—I will not press the issue of how we are seen by other nations—I do not put as much importance on it perhaps as you do. I believe it is important that we are seen to be fair and that we are fair. My point is that we do not overdo the fostering of many separate identities. I think our country, as a single entity of Canadians, is number one. Then the other is that I do not originate here any more than—I really do not know how many originated here, but even our aboriginal people came from Asia.

1430

Mr Bisson: I think what I am trying to get at is that we seem to have a hard time within Canada trying to identify what it is to be Canadian. That is one of the underlying things we are hearing here. But when you speak to Canadians who have travelled abroad, it seems that people outside of Canada do not have a hard time trying to identify what our identity is: Our identity is built on our tolerance. By purporting that we do not protect minority language rights or we do not protect minorities in any way, do you not think that takes away from what our identity is, that we are not the melting pot, that we are not trying to build a tolerant society? If we were to try to take back those things we gave to minorities or take back whatever institutions we have built for the greater good of Canadians, our social programs or whatever, do you not think it would be detrimental to our identity as seen by people outside of Canada and seen from people inside?

Mr Redman: I do not suggest that we take things back. I think we perhaps de-emphasize. It is like the profusion of holidays in New York City. They have reached the point where they have about as many holidays as they have working days, and you cannot take them back. If we have a situation where we try to emphasize our Canadianism, for lack of a better word, it is worth while. I do not have any trouble determining what I am. I am a Canadian. I do not have to live in Ontario, but that is what I am, a Canadian, and proud of it.

As I have mentioned to Mr Beer, I have travelled extensively. I have spent four or five years in total, travelling out of the country, and lived out of the country in Europe for a number of years. When I came back through the

airport in Malton I always felt I was coming back to the best country I had ever been in. I have never felt otherwise. But I base that on the fact that I have a strong identity as a Canadian.

Mr Beer: I wanted to follow up on a question Steve Offer was asking you around referenda. Have you given some thought to the kinds of questions you think would be most apt to be used in referenda? Are we talking about any change to the Constitution? Is there some way of dividing that? Also, would you include in that this idea of the plebiscite, which is not binding in terms of specific action but rather serves to set out an opinion? I thought, in the way you were answering that, you were perhaps thinking at least some of these might be more of the plebiscite type as opposed to a binding "Thou shalt do it this way."

Mr Redman: This is a good point. You have certainly hit on it. I am not a political scientist. I was in industry, I am an aviator. You are quite right that "plebiscite" is probably more what I mean than "referendum." I drew this up yesterday and it should be buffed a little more perhaps.

PETER LOWRY

The Chair: I call Peter Lowry.

Mr Lowry: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the committee, for the opportunity to speak.

After reading your discussion paper, Changing for the Better, I appreciate that you have a very difficult task. I wish in one way your task was impossible. I wish there was a line of six million Ontario residents at the door to tell you of their hopes for our country.

Some people seem to suggest that surveys will tell you how people feel about issues, but I expect members of this committee to be among the most knowledgeable people in Canada of the dangers of making political decisions by opinion polls. It is only when people face others and say "This I believe" or go to a polling place and mark their ballot and say "This is what I do or do not want" that we can have a true sense of their thoughts, their wishes or maybe just understand their confusion.

I am here to admit my confusion. I do not have the overwhelming confidence of a young political science student. I certainly do not have the immense ego of a John Crispo. I cannot understand why, in your paper, you want to make up a shopping list of constitutional reforms when there is no place to go shopping. Should we not address the process of reform first? I am one Canadian who would prefer to address concerns about the Constitution in an open and democratic manner. I really do not want the boys in the back room shooting craps over my country. Why can we not bring together a representative assembly for the purpose of discussing our Constitution?

I hope you agree with me that Canadians are not collectively child-like, demanding, intolerant, racist, parochial or immature in their democracy. Contrary to the last speaker, travelling in many parts of the world, I have found that there is a widespread, very important opinion that says Canadians are quite mature, generous, tolerant and open people who are quite capable of managing their own affairs. I believe that, and I am sure you do too.

What I do not understand, though, are constitutional discussions that make it look as though federal and provincial politicians want to carve up powers as though it is a contest to see who is more important. I do not think Canadians care who is more important.

I believe Canadians—whether they want to say it in French, English, a native language or any of our heritage languages—will say they do care that there is equality across our country. They care about equality of human rights and freedoms. I believe they care about equal access to education, to jobs, to justice, to health care and the right to address their gods in their own way, to protect their environment, to speak their language, preserve their culture and heritage and to find fulfilment as humans and Canadians. Add to that list, if you wish, but please delete nothing.

I do not understand those who want to discuss our Confederation in terms of economic values. If I have one objection to your paper, it discusses Canada in economic terms. Canada was never created as an economic unit. It has never functioned well as an economic unit. Canada paid a high price, for example, for British Columbia and Newfoundland, and we are still paying. I think they are worth it. They not only look good as book-ends to this country, but they contribute substantially to the cultural mélange that is Canada. Would you want a country without the Bill Vander Zalm or the John Crosbys?

Interjections.

Mr Lowry: Fair comment.

The Chair: You will get some interesting reactions to that, Mr Lowry.

Mr Lowry: I was trying to think of an NDP member from either end.

Mr Beer: We will provide some names.

Mr Lowry: I am not only confused but very concerned about suggestions in our country that so-called collective rights can override the rights of individuals. I have always believed that the measure of a democracy is the willingness and the ability of the majority to protect the rights of minorities and individuals. I worry whether we are doing that well in our country. I feel strongly that we must use both logic and passion to dissuade those who feel so personally inadequate that they speak against the use of French in Ontario. I am also very frightened by those who use racist terms such as "québécois pure laine" in Quebec. Is this Canada of the 1990s or Germany and France of the 1930s?

What worries me about Canada's future are those people not only in Quebec but even in our dear old grey Globe and Mail who talk about Quebec leaving Canada. I do not understand how that can be done. I do not see how we can allow it. Quebec is integral to Canada. Canada does not exist without it. The death of our country cannot be decided by voters in one province.

1440

I have heard some people say we should just let Quebec go. I must admit I do not understand that statement either. It could only be made by someone who cannot see the beauty of the Laurentians in the fall, enjoy the joie de

vivre of winter carnival in Quebec, learn the history lessons of old Montreal or take a simple tranquil journey around the Gaspé. That is Canada. I am a Canadian and Quebec belongs to me, too.

One of the most important considerations is that even if eight out of 10 voters in la belle province voted to somehow separate our land into "theirs" and "ours," if just 20% said no, that 20% would represent one million Canadians, one million Quebecers who wanted to remain part of our country. I, for one, would not stand aside and see the rights of one Canadian violated. Could you join me in protecting the rights of a million?

If I have any advice for this committee, and I do not envy you, it is to speak clearly and distinctly as Canadians. One of every three Canadians lives in this province. There is no need for us to be parochial. Do not demean us by negotiating federal versus provincial powers. Do not just be a peacemaker: take a stand you believe in. Do not insult us by speaking of "your people." Speak from your own heart. If you do what you sincerely believe is right, you might be. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Lowry. There is some time for some questions.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation, Mr Lowry. I want to ask you a question around a constituent assembly. We have had a presenter this morning, we have had a number of others, who have addressed that issue. One of the points is, how do we go about getting that opinion of the mythical population out there that is truly representative of all Canadians? Do we need to use some mechanism that is different from using our legislative bodies? What is your sense about that constituent assembly? How do you see that coming together and how is it necessarily any more representative than, let us say, the House of Commons or the Ontario Legislature?

Mr Lowry: If I may look at that in terms of the point I was making about dividing powers, my recommendation to the federal government on its committee that is sitting shortly on this issue is that an elected constituent assembly must be just for that purpose. It is not there to divide powers. It is there to do what is right for the people of Canada. As a federal member or provincial member or Toronto alderman—that gets in the way of our thinking, because we tend to increase and want to build our own nest, build our own power. I think a constituent assembly gets around that problem. A constituent assembly gives us the opportunity to look at things in terms of the needs of people as opposed to the needs of politicians. I am sorry. I have nothing against politicians, nothing at all.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Lowry.

Mr Lowry: Thank you.

KEN HESTER

The Chair: Ken Hester, come on up. Go ahead.

Mr Hester: On 30 June 1990 the Meech Lake constitutional deal failed. I was a strong supporter of that and I was very surprised at the enormous reaction throughout English Canada that was anti the fact that Quebec is a separate group of people. It seems to me that we must

re-explore this Canada of ours in a much more detailed and definite way. On 30 January 1991, seven months from the failure of the Meech Lake accord, the Allaire report was released. This report was commissioned by the Quebec Liberal Party, the most federalist party sitting in the Quebec house of assembly. It has been endorsed by the Quebec Liberal leader, Premier Bourassa.

While it has much that is admirable—I have not read the report, but I have read newspaper accounts of it—it seems to envision a strong Quebec in a weak Canada. Federal powers under the Allaire report scheme would be unacceptably emasculated. In addition, the federal government has been served with an ultimatum: accept the contents of this report within 18 months or Quebec will call a referendum on separation. As 75% of Quebecers now favour sovereignty at this juncture, this is really tantamount to telling us that Canada submits or Quebec goes.

On some things both the people of Quebec and the rest of Canada agree. We agree on democratic, not military, solutions to problems. We agree on maintaining economic and fiscal responsibility and on keeping an intact social net for those people who are aged and unable to work. However, it appears that on one thing we strongly disagree: everywhere across English Canada we are Canadians first and provincial second, but in Quebec we are québécois first and Canadians second. It is this that is the real problem, it seems to me. Perhaps it is an irrational problem, but it is this one that is the sticking point for us all. If it cannot be resolved, and I do not think it can, in that case Quebec will separate and English Canadians, if that happens, must make sure that their country, the new Canada, is protected.

Ontario's role is critical in all this. In Canada now, the province of Ontario is by far the dominant player. We have 37% of the population and proportionately more of the Canadian gross national product. In a Canada without Quebec, Ontario would have half the new Canadian population and contribute substantially more than half the gross national product. Can that overwhelming predominance of Ontario be resolved? I do not know, but it seems to me that for this reason it is really critical for Ontario to take the lead in birthing a new Canada.

1450

We cannot allow the discredited, Quebec-based federal government to negotiate for all Canadians in this dilemma. The province of Ontario must initiate constitutional discussions with the rest of English Canada. Those of us who love Canada must talk about a new entity, one without Quebec. Let us, English-speaking Canadians, devise the Canada we want and not have something foisted on us by Quebec. It is the time the ideals and dreams of 75% of Canadians were the dominating influence in Canadian constitutional talks, not the desires of a recalcitrant 25% of the people.

With separation we will face enormous disruptions such as we have never faced before. We will have to ensure transportation and communications links through Quebec to the Maritimes. We must recognize that separation will lead to the exodus of many English-speaking people from Quebec and the emigration of francophones from the rest of Canada into Quebec. There will be a tremendous

amount of bitter feeling engendered all the way across this country, bitter from the point of view of the Quebecers, bitter from the point of view of English Canada, saying that these people got out.

But just as in the US Civil War, separation might very well strengthen the new Canada. Piet Hein, the Danish poet, puts it in a nutshell:

Here is a fact that should help you to fight a bit longer.

Things that do not actually kill you outright make you stronger.

In Quebec the flowering of this nationalistic feeling has led to a flowering of the arts, and the same thing could well happen in a new Canada. For too long we have assumed that Quebec was what made us different from Americans. Now we must recognize that Canadians have different social values, different political values and a more humane outlook than Americans. We must stimulate and enhance these aspects that make us different, that make us Canadian. We must take to heart the words of a great American president, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

In a new Canada we could be united because we came through a dramatic confrontation and survived. Far from being a disaster, the separation of Quebec should be viewed as a possible release for English Canada, just as it is viewed as a release in Quebec. It could well lead to a national euphoria. Suddenly, we will understand that this is our country, a unique country, united as never before. We in Ontario should view Quebec's probable separation as a special opportunity, an opportunity for Ontario to lead in forming a new Canada.

Mr Offer: Mr Hester is the scenario which you have painted, assuming the separation of Quebec, since you have gone on and talked about a potential euphoria and things of this nature, could you share with us what you see in the scenario you have painted as the status of Franco-Ontarians, the status of the French language in this province of Ontario and in fact in all of the provinces that are in this new Canada you have created?

Mr Hester: I would see that new Canada as being unilingual but with a tremendous amount of acceptance of French and other languages as well. In Quebec we have certainly restricted advertising and so on in any language other than French. I would not see that at all. New Brunswick of course is a bilingual province, and you know there are many people in Ontario who are francophones. I would see English Canada being unilingual. But within that, let's say Sault Ste Marie wants to talk about having francophone schools. That would be fine. It would be fine if they had Spanish schools as well. We would be very much more flexible as far as language is concerned, but we would not be protecting the francophones the way it is done now.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Sir, do you see Ontario taking the leadership role in this English Canada that you speak about?

Mr Hester: Absolutely. We have to. Ontario has to. It is going to be 50%. Let's say that Quebec separates: 50% of Canada is Ontario as far as population is concerned,

more than 50% as far as the economics are concerned. Somehow or other, if we are going to have a Canada, we have to be able to set up some sort of regional representation, an elected Senate. That is absolutely critical.

The Allaire report suggests we abolish the Senate. The Senate seems to me to be the one thing that might keep this Canada together. If we can have representation from one end of the country to the other, where people in the west feel that they are really contributing and people in the Maritimes feel that they are really contributing to the government of Canada, then I think perhaps we will be able to revive this Canadian concept.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr Hester.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE FRANCOPHONES D'AFRIQUE

The Chair: Jean Calvin Gweth-Nanah, come on up. Go ahead, sir.

M. Gweth-Nanah : Je vais lire mon exposé en français.

M. le Président : Ça va.

M. Gweth-Nanah : Nous ne pouvons pas réfléchir sur l'avenir du Canada sans parler de l'expérience du passé et du présent. Le traité de Paris de 1763 qui a fait de la Nouvelle-France une colonie britannique à la suite de la défaite des royales françaises sur les plaines d'Abraham n'a jamais été accepté par les Canadiens français.

Le rejet de la colonisation culturelle anglaise a amené le gouvernement de Londres à reconnaître aux colonisés français en 1774 le droit d'utiliser leur langue, de pratiquer leur religion, la religion catholique et le droit français. Implicitement, ils ont reconnu le droit à la différence et consacré la société distincte et l'unité dans la diversité.

L'histoire du Canada depuis l'occupation de la Nouvelle-France par les Britanniques et les Anglo-Américains n'a jamais cessé de connaître de soubresauts. À cet égard, les événements des années 70 ont rappelé étrangement ceux de 1867 sous la direction de Papineau. L'Acte de l'Amérique du Nord britannique signé par la reine Victoria n'a été que la conséquence d'un compromis entre francophones et anglophones.

En 1867, le Canada était mal parti. La mise en place de la structure d'un nouvel État nord-américain avait oublié les premiers habitants du pays, à savoir les Amérindiens ainsi que les populations noires venues soit des États-Unis, soit des Antilles d'où ils fuyaient l'esclavage à moins d'avoir été amenées directement par les Français qui voulaient s'établir ici. À titre de mémoire, en 1608 l'interprète de Champlain, lors de son arrivée en Nouvelle-France était d'origine malgache. La présence africaine est manifeste, comme en témoignent les Noirs de la Nouvelle-Écosse et du village de Chatham en Ontario. L'histoire nous apprend que les marrons, grands combattants de la liberté, étaient des Noirs venus d'Afrique qui n'acceptaient de voir bafouer leur dignité.

1500

L'appropriation du Canada par deux peuples d'origine européenne s'est toujours opposé à la réalisation de l'unité nationale et a fait du Canada un colosse aux pieds d'argile. L'ouverture des frontières à l'immigration n'a rien arrangé,

puisque le recensement national de 1986 nous apprend qu'il y a neuf millions de Canadiens qui ne sont ni d'origine britannique ni d'origine française. Ceci constitue un tournant nouveau dans l'histoire du Canada, puisque l'article 2 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés permet à ses nouveaux venus de s'installer n'importe où au pays et en fait implicitement des pionniers au même titre que les premiers venus.

La perception du Canada par les nouveaux Canadiens que nous sommes est tout à fait différente de celle des Canadiens français et des Canadiens anglais. Nous avons choisi en toute connaissance de cause de nous établir au Canada. Nous en avons fait notre patrie. Nous voulons sa prospérité et nous entendons sauvegarder son unité par tous les moyens à notre disposition, même — souhaitons que cela n'arrive pas — au prix de notre sang.

Nous, Canadiens francophones venus d'Afrique, avons une tradition qui est inscrite dans la charte de l'Organisation de l'unité africaine, l'OUA. Cet article stipule que nos pays doivent oeuvrer pour le renforcement dans l'état du sens de l'unité du continent et condamne vigoureusement toute tentative de sécession d'une région d'un État africain, que ce soit un grand ou un petit pays. De même, nous avons combattu la tentative de sécession du Biafra au Nigéria, celle de l'Érythrée en Éthiopie et la politique de développement séparé par le biais des Bantoustans en Afrique du Sud. De même, nous sommes décidés à défendre l'intégrité territoriale du Canada contre tous ceux qui veulent démanteler notre pays. Il est temps que les Canadiens prennent leurs responsabilités pour dire non aux indépendantistes de tous bords.

À l'heure où on parle de mondialisation de l'économie et de la culture par les médias interposés, il est absurde d'entendre parler de l'indépendance d'une province canadienne. Même si le Québec occupait la position géographique de Terre-Neuve, son indépendance serait inacceptable. À plus forte raison, un Québec géopolitiquement mal placé et dont la sécession couperait le Canada en deux, comment pourrions-nous admettre un tel principe qui vise à détruire notre pays ?

Bien sûr que le Canada n'est pas un paradis ; nous les Noirs en savons quelque chose. Et il en est de même pour les Amérindiens et pour l'ensemble des minorités dites visibles mais qui sont loin de l'être quand il s'agit des avantages. Bien sûr que les Canadiens français sont différents des Canadiens anglophones, mais moi aussi je suis différent des deux, en particulier des Canadiens français avec lesquels je partage pourtant la même langue.

Mais j'aimerais voir exprimer, par l'intermédiaire de nos médias, par exemple Radio-Canada et en français surtout, ma culture. Après tout, Léopold Sédar Senghor est membre de l'Académie française. Il prouve que nous ne sommes pas les derniers quand il s'agit de parler ou d'écrire le français.

Nous sommes fiers d'être francophones et de le clamer devant les anglophones. Nous sommes fiers d'être Canadiens et de parler les deux langues officielles de notre pays. Nous sommes originaires de cette partie du monde, l'Afrique, où la plupart des pays utilisent le français — 26 sur 50 — l'anglais, l'arabe, le portugais, le swahili et une

multitude de langues locales. Pour nous qui venons d'Afrique, nous avons du mal à comprendre que les Canadiens, qui n'ont que deux langues officielles, passent leur temps à se quereller. Nous pensons que parler plusieurs langues est une richesse et nous avons besoin du maximum de langues pour compétitionner dans l'économie mondiale.

Le rôle des différents paliers du gouvernement et de partis politiques est de montrer aux Canadiens l'importance économique de la mosaïque culturelle canadienne, de leur apprendre à se connaître, de s'accepter tels qu'ils sont pour le plus grand bien du pays et l'avenir commun de nos enfants. Pour atteindre cet objectif, la constitution de 1867 et la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés de 1982 doivent être adaptées aux réalités nouvelles du pays et du monde. Il est inadmissible qu'en 1991 il n'y ait pas de libre-échange entre les provinces canadiennes alors que nous avons signé un traité de libre-échange avec les États-Unis et que nous nous apprêtons à en signer un autre avec le Mexique.

Il est absurde que le Canada ne contrôle pas son système d'éducation et que les diplômés d'une province aient des difficultés à faire accepter leur diplôme dans les provinces du pays. Il est absurde que les diplômés formés ailleurs aux frais des autres pays ne puissent pas trouver d'emplois ici quand ils s'installent au Canada. Il est regrettable que les Canadiens n'aient pas le sens d'appartenance à leur pays, au point où on se demande qui est Canadien. Les gens installés dans notre pays depuis plusieurs générations se font encore appeler Italiens, Juifs, Portugais, Grecs, Africains et j'en passe. La seule exception est au moment de payer les impôts, car Revenu Canada ne fait pas de discrimination en matière de paiements d'impôts.

L'avenir du Canada ne dépend pas uniquement des Canadiens. La géopolitique a fait de notre pays un tampon entre les deux superpuissances à travers l'océan Arctique. L'Union soviétique et les États-Unis ont chacun une défense qui depuis 1940 vise la destruction l'un de l'autre. Chacun de ces pays a mis au point des armes qui peuvent atteindre l'autre via le Canada. De plus, le Nord canadien est devenu une zone économique intéressante pour les communications aériennes. Mieux, le Groenland, qui appartient à la Norvège, pays européen, abrite les mêmes populations que le Nord canadien. La zone polaire septentrionale joue un rôle de plus en plus important dans les prévisions météorologiques mondiales et la protection de l'environnement. C'est aussi une grande nappe d'eau pour l'humanité où les savants étudient les problèmes relatifs à la pêche.

La conjoncture de tous ces centres d'intérêts et la sécurité du territoire national ont des répercussions sur les relations internationales du Canada et sur la politique interne vis-à-vis des peuples, les populations nordiques. Mais le fédéral peut-il accorder des avantages aux Inuit qui leur assurent le contrôle du Nord canadien sans faire autant pour les autres groupes amérindiens du pays ? L'Est canadien, après avoir bénéficié des relations économiques privilégiées avec l'Europe, éprouve aujourd'hui des difficultés car l'Europe préfère se procurer des matières premières dans des régions du monde où elles coûtent

moins cher. Le fait que l'Europe occidentale ait le même niveau de développement que l'Amérique du Nord et que ses produits finis soient similaires aux produits nord-américains ne facilite pas les échanges entre ces deux parties du monde, d'où le déperissement de la voie maritime du Saint-Laurent.

1510

En d'autres termes, il est faux de prétendre que c'est le gouvernement fédéral qui ne favorise pas le développement économique des provinces Maritimes et du Québec par des investissements. La vérité est que les grands axes de l'économie mondiale se trouvent désormais orientés vers les nouveaux pays industrialisés de l'Asie du Sud-Est, soit le Japon, la Corée du Sud, l'île de Singapour, le Hong-Kong et le Taiwan qui ont besoin de matières premières pour leurs industries en pleine croissance et non de produits finis. La conséquence de cette situation est l'épaouissement de l'économie de l'ouest du continent américain en général et du Canada en particulier. À titre d'exemple, Thunder Bay en Ontario, le plus grand port céréalier du monde, a perdu son importance au profit de Vancouver et le gouvernement canadien a dû doubler sa ligne de chemin de fer pour répondre aux besoins du port de Vancouver.

L'avenir économique du Canada se trouve désormais dans l'Ouest, qui permet des échanges avec les pays du Sud-Est asiatique via l'océan Pacifique. Ce phénomène nouveau pose un problème politique. N'aurions-nous pas à signer un traité de libre-échange avec les pays du Pacifique, sachant que le libre-échange avec notre puissant voisin du sud hypothèque notre avenir en tant que nation indépendante ?

L'Ontario doit demeurer le poumon économique du Canada, de la région des Grands Lacs. L'Ontario doit développer ses relations économiques avec le Nord, l'Est, l'Ouest, donner les chances égales à tous les Ontariens en matière d'éducation, formation professionnelle et en matière d'emploi s'il veut rester concurrentiel à l'échelle mondiale. Pour ce faire, il doit faire tout ce qui est en son pouvoir pour sauvegarder l'unité canadienne car son propre avenir en dépend. Il serait naïf de croire que la prospérité de l'Ontario se maintiendrait si le pays éclatait. L'exemple du Bangladesh, détaché du Pakistan, a été un coup dur pour ce dernier pays.

On voit mal un Canada coupé en deux par un Québec indépendant survivre en tant qu'État unique tout comme on voit mal un Québec indépendant le demeurer longtemps sans se faire avaler par les États-Unis. S'il est vrai que notre pays est une démocratie et que selon la définition qu'en donne Montesquieu dans l'Esprit des lois — la démocratie, c'est le gouvernement du peuple, par le peuple et pour le peuple — il est urgent que le gouvernement fédéral organise un référendum sur l'avenir constitutionnel du pays afin de lui permettre de rédiger une nouvelle constitution plus conforme aux réalités de notre temps et capable d'éliminer toutes velléités de sécession. Merci.

M. Beer : Vous parlez du point de vue de l'indépendance ou de la séparation du Québec du reste du pays, qu'on ne peut pas l'accepter. Mais qu'est-ce que vous dites

si 80%, 90% des Québécois optent clairement pour un pays indépendant ? À quelle action le Canada peut-il vraiment passer ou devrait-il passer, ou ne faut-il pas accepter une si claire déclaration du point de vue des Québécois ?

M. Gweth-Nanah : Je n'ai pas de difficulté à accepter la position québécoise, mais il faut se rappeler que dès le départ, en 1867, même quand vivait le premier ministre, le défunt John Macdonald, il y a avait ce même problème parce qu'il fallait choisir entre devenir une république, une royauté, une fédération ou une confédération. Je pense que jusqu'à sa mort, et l'histoire nous en témoigne, il n'a pas pu arriver à décider vraiment ce qu'il fallait. Les ancêtres de ce pays ont adopté cette position d'aller du côté britannique de peur d'être engloutis pas les Américains. Donc, nous avons formé un pays par la peur. Aujourd'hui nous sommes face à cette même redéfinition de ce pays que nous aimons tant. Je pense que les Québécois aussi aiment ce pays.

Maintenant, s'il faut repartager les pouvoirs, redéfinir certains termes : comme je le disais tantôt, nous parlons de multiculturalisme ; 9 millions de 27 millions en 1986, selon le recensement, sont d'origines autres que britannique et française. Ça pose un problème. Est-ce qu'on va faire un pays pour ces multiculturels ? Si tout à coup ils décidaient qu'ils voulaient former leur pays, est-ce qu'on leur permettrait de former leur pays et laisser les autres d'origine française et britannique à côté ? C'est ça le dilemme.

Donc, il faut qu'on puisse s'asseoir de bonne foi, je pense, anglophones, francophones et nous les multiculturels, comme on nous appelle. On nous appelle les minorités visibles. Je n'aime pas tellement le mot, mais je pense que chaque fois que je passe dans la rue je suis assez visible pour ne pas me faire appeler minorité visible.

Mais l'autre position, quand je parle de démocratie : il faut respecter le désir du Québec mais dans le contexte canadien, parce qu'il ne faut pas oublier que depuis la Confédération — et c'est là, et j'en ai parlé dès le départ — le Québec avait été reconnu dès le départ comme société distincte quand la reine Victoria a signé le document. Donc, le Québec avait droit à sa diversité.

Donc, aujourd'hui, si c'est le pouvoir qu'on veut vraiment, partager le pouvoir, peut-être que le gouvernement fédéral a plus de pouvoir ou les gouvernements provinciaux ont plus de pouvoir, bien, qu'on se le dise ouvertement mais qu'on ne vienne pas nous dire : «Pourquoi on ne laisserait pas la chance à Terre-Neuve?»

Il y a Terre-Neuve qui depuis longtemps se plaint et dit qu'elle n'a pas tellement eu sa part du gâteau. S'ils décidaient de partir du Canada, qu'est-ce qu'on dirait ? On aurait le même problème. Tout à coup on aurait notre frontière modifiée et ainsi de suite, la Nouvelle-Écosse — Donc, le problème est un problème de fond. On a survécu de 1867 jusqu'aujourd'hui. Il faudrait maintenant faire une nouvelle constitution. Et le cas de Sault-Sainte-Marie, soudainement — c'était l'été dernier — nous l'a montré, et les Amérindiens. Alors, si on répond aux problèmes du Québec, les autres qui vont se plaindre, est-ce qu'on va leur dire : «Allez-y aussi» ? Autant dire qu'on n'a plus de pays.

1520

BRIAN GRAFF

The Chair: I call Brian Graff. Go ahead, sir.

Mr Graff: Hello. My name is Brian Graff. I am here as a private citizen, a person who very much loves his country. I identify myself very strongly as being a Canadian and I always hope that I will be able to say that.

I am not here representing any group. I am just representing myself. I am not an expert in any field, economics or political science or law, that would give me an expert opinion on the issues of reforming Canada, of the Constitution, of anything. But I am a person who has been involved in politics off and on over the years and I feel I have a responsibility to in some way contribute to the process, if I can.

I am very glad to have the opportunity to be here. I only wish that we had had something like this five years ago, before Meech Lake was agreed upon in secret by 11 first ministers. If we had had a chance to talk about Quebec's demands first, maybe we could have come up with something that would have been more acceptable to both sides.

The only concern I have had about this series of committee hearings is the degree to which some Ontarians who have come before this have used this as a chance to talk about things that are totally unrelated to the current constitutional crisis. They are asking for more money or other things, and I hope this sort of process could be extended in future to issues such as native rights or multiculturalism or whatever, but I am going to try to stick on topic as much as possible. My talk is broken into two parts. The first part is largely just a series of ideas or positions I have about ways which we should change our government institutions and the way we elect our government and just the Constitution as a whole. The second part, which I think is going to be more off the top of my head, is just sort of how I feel we should respond to Quebec and what the future may very well bring in resolving the current crisis. At the very end I do have a proposal which I hope might have some effect in keeping Quebec within Canada. It is not something that specifically relates to the Ontario government, but it does relate to Canadians as a whole.

The Chair: Mr Graff, before you get into the brief, you have given us a very detailed brief. I can see from just glancing at it—

Mr Graff: I am not going to read all of it.

The Chair: Good. I just wanted to make sure you are aware of the time constraint we are under.

Mr Graff: Yes. The only parts I am going to be reading from are the very first section and the very last section. The middle, like I said, is the part that is going to be off the top of my head, because I realize it is too long.

If the Meech Lake accord had passed, it is likely that the constitutional process would have continued, as it had previously, to be but a series of patch jobs without ever there being any real chance to examine comprehensively the greater issues of our Constitution and of the way we organize ourselves. What is needed, I believe, is an overall

reform that questions everything about our government system, because I do not think Canadians really understand a lot of the aspects.

Many of the aspects of our government system are anachronisms. For example, we have the Privy Council. I do not think anybody has any idea what the purpose of the Privy Council is supposed to be or what it does or why we still have it. Whatever role it does play, maybe there are ways of doing that which are more relevant and more democratic to most Canadians.

One thing is, in doing such a thing, we should start from the top down, and perhaps the first thing for me is that it is time we should finally have a made-in-Canada head of state. For many French Canadians, the British-based monarchy is not an endearing institution. As well, it is not a symbol of great relevance to the increasing number of Canadians of non-British heritage, including the aboriginal peoples. The Queen has no real power as such, most of it having been transferred to the Governor General. This was made abundantly clear with the GST bill, in which she had no choice but to sign it into law despite the controversy over the way in which it was passed.

In the past, I tended to support the monarchy, as I believed it to be a symbol which helped to distinguish ourselves from the US as a nation which gained independence peacefully. But now I feel that other things are more important, namely that we must create national institutions and symbols that are equally valid and relevant to all Canadians, regardless of their ethnic origin or their religion. You should remember that the Queen is of course a religious symbol as the head of the Anglican church.

Twenty-five years ago we did this sort of thing with the flag. We got a brand-new flag. No one individual group, British, French or anybody, could claim that it had a special relationship to it, that it was its symbol more than it was anybody else's, with the possible exception of course that the maple leaf does not grow in all parts of the country.

Anyway, I hope that by such reforms as creating a new head of state that everybody equally can identify with, it will have an effect of unifying the country.

Recent events have shown us that while the American system has too many checks and balances and power is too decentralized within each level of government, such as the budget process in the United States where they could not agree on anything, our Canadian system is the exact opposite. There are not enough checks and balances in our parliamentary system as it has evolved to the current time. Power within each level of government is centralized in the head of government, particularly when that is a majority government. I believe the greater power should be given to bodies which are independent of interference from the government so as to prevent abuse of power by the government and otherwise make government more responsive to public needs. This is a role of the Senate, the head of state and so on.

Unfortunately, the current institution of Governor General is not adequate to this task, as it is currently an appointed head of state, or it would be an appointed head of state if you made that the head of state, and it is quite likely that whoever was appointed Governor General the government

would of course be completely sympathetic with government policy. I also believe you cannot give an appointed person or body any real authority in a democracy. So I think that, importantly, it is becoming increasingly clear that there is a need to provide more checks and balances on the exercise of power by the Prime Minister, because increasingly power is centralized in his office.

I believe we should replace both monarchy and governors general with an elected president, but I would not want anything like the American President, which so totally dominates things. I would, though, require that any aspirants to the position of president previously have held elected office so that they be familiar with parliamentary procedures and also that they be competent in both official languages, again so that they can communicate with all Canadians.

One of the key flaws of our electoral system is that people elected by our current process do not necessarily represent a majority of the voters. Our present system, where a candidate with the largest number of votes is the winner, is not necessarily democratic when there are more than two candidates or parties in the running. Ours is a simple-majority system in which the leader in votes wins. What this means is that a candidate with less than an absolute majority of 50% of the votes plus one will be elected.

1530

This system is seriously flawed and the results are not often a true representation of public sentiment. For example, in the recent Ontario election, the winning party formed a majority government with less than 38% of the vote. This problem is magnified if there are other considerations in voting and we only have the one vote for everything. For example, if a party advocates a policy that is opposed by the majority, it may still win even though more voters voted for parties that were taking the majority position.

This is what happened with free trade in the last federal election. The majority of the public were opposed to free trade but because the vote was split between the NDP and the Liberals, the Conservatives were able to form the government and impose free trade, even though the majority of Canadians did not support this. This makes it highly debatable in our elections whether the winning party really has a mandate from the voters.

One solution often suggested to reform our electoral system is to move to some system of proportional representation. This is not desirable, in my view, as it might lead to a perpetual series of minority governments in which small parties representing extreme ideologies or special interests have a disproportionately large influence on public policy by holding the balance of power in the elected assembly. This is the case in Israel where you have very small, extreme religious parties who tend to influence the public policy.

Another problem with this system is that in portioning out seats to those parties that are underrepresented, you create two classes of representatives. You either create elected members who represent no geographic constituency or else you have constituencies that are doubly represented in the assembly. Either one of these situations is undesirable and is not truly democratic.

The system I advocate is one where a candidate has to get an absolute majority of votes, and this would be done by allowing voters to mark a second or third choice on a ballot. This could also be done by having a runoff election as in France, but I believe a better method would be to do away with marking a second or third choice on a ballot. Those ballots which mark a candidate to come in at the very bottom, the first choice would then be put aside and the second or third choice would then be used until one candidate had a majority of the votes that were still valid.

This system eliminates the cost, voter apathy and confusion of having two election days, and has an additional advantage in eliminating the need for strategic voting in an election as you can vote first for the party that you really support, rather than voting primarily to keep another party from getting into power. While this system might take longer to tabulate if done by hand, this could be eliminated through using electronic methods to count the ballots.

Currently, the people in the west disapprove of the way in which election results from the east have been tabulated before voting has finished in the west, which has sometimes left them feeling that their votes are irrelevant as the party that will form the government is already certain. No means of eliminating this problem by varying voting hours in each time zone should be utilized as this would alter the election outcome by affecting the opportunity of voters in the far east or far west to vote during otherwise reasonable hours, such as early morning or early evening after work. The approach that should be used to prevent this problem might be to actually delay the vote count until the next day or until all the polls have closed across the country.

I would also propose that election dates should not be set by the government but should be held on prearranged days similar to the American system. The exception to this rule would be if a government was defeated on a non-confidence motion and the head of state did not believe it was possible for any party to gain the confidence of Parliament. These reforms that I am proposing should be implemented at both the federal and provincial levels.

It may be ironic that while I am a strong Canadian nationalist, many of my suggestions would make the structure and responsibilities of Canadian governments more like that of the US. The idea that we have to be more like the US in our political institutions if we plan to remain independent is something that has long been a paradox in Ontario politics that long pre-dates Confederation. It has also been the reality, for we have long since abandoned many of the ideals held by the Loyalists and the Family Compact that equated democracy and elected assemblies with mob rule and that favoured government by a small élite and saw the public as an ignorant rabble. We should accept that we are in a unique position to try to combine the best elements of both the American and the British traditions.

I believe that the triple E Senate, as proposed by the west, is a blatantly undemocratic proposal that is an attempt to grab power and runs counter to true democracy. The areas that actually lose the most power are not southern Ontario and Toronto, but probably more like northern Ontario, areas which are currently not very influential. For

example, PEI has more representation in the Senate than Vancouver Island, which is actually larger and has a larger population and just as many distinct issues.

Western alienation is a real and serious problem that must be addressed, but so far little has been said by the east to defend itself or to counteract it, possibly as we have believed we would only be resented more by seeming to be so smug and contented with the status quo. For example, there is the Ottawa Valley line of the 1960s when we were forced in Ontario to buy western petroleum instead of importing cheaper oil from overseas. Similarly, Ontarians have not complained about things like the wheat board where we pay higher prices for grain than export or world prices in order to support western farmers, while at the same time we are subsidizing them with our tax dollars through programs such as drought relief.

The Chair: Mr Graff, you are nearing the end of your time, just so that you know that.

Mr Graff: Okay. I will just quickly go through some of my points.

The point I am making here is, forget the triple E Senate. The real problem with western alienation is strict party discipline which prevents the views of the west from being heard.

Actually, I am going to just skip to the end right now because I have a proposal I would like to make.

If we want to continue to live in a strong and united Canada, then perhaps the first and most important thing we can do is to let the people of Quebec know that they are wanted very much in Canada and that they are an important part of Canada, that Canada would not really be Canada without them and that we want Quebec to stay in Canada. We do not reject Quebec at all. I like Quebec very much myself. I have been there several times and I have always enjoyed myself.

I was opposed to the Meech Lake accord, both for the process and for its content. I was dismayed by the means that were used to get it passed and the whole thing. I just hope the result of this whole thing is that Canada can remain a country and that we do not end up being forced to be so centralized or so fragmented that we become part of the United States. This is something I was very much afraid of at the time Meech Lake died.

I do not believe Canadians can rely on Robert Bourassa to defend federalism to the people of Quebec, given that he is more concerned with maintaining power by preventing a split in his party. He tries to walk the fine line between the federalist and nationalist provincial Liberal factions, and his style is to try to stay in front of the parade rather than to lead it or change its course. His support for federalism seems to be based more on economics than anything else.

Nor can we rely on Brian Mulroney to turn the tide on Quebec separatism or to fight for the type of strong Canadian government that is necessary for Canada to survive in the face of the United States and prosper in the long run, for Mr Mulroney is in fact the one who is responsible for the current situation by trying to appease Quebec nationalists and accept them into his cabinet. Nor can we rely on the

Quebec media to present the case for federalism as many of them are already openly in support of sovereignty.

I believe we have to find ways of going around them and appeal directly to the people of Quebec if we wish to affect public opinion and increase support for federalism in Quebec. The way to keep Canada strong and united is not to appease Quebec sovereigntists but to debate them and refute their arguments and assertions and offer alternatives of Canadian nationalism in which their deeper aspirations can be met just as effectively or even better.

It has to be an idea of Canada to which they have an emotional attachment, not just a temporarily pragmatic one merely based on economic arguments which may very well change. I am dismayed that our Premier has not really said anything other than pounded on the economic advantages of Confederation so far. Quebec has to recognize that a strong and unified Canada is the best way in the long run for the long-term benefit, vitality and survival of French culture and heritage and language in Quebec and in North America as a whole.

To do this, I propose that we learn from the free trade debate in which businesses, unions, private organizations and prominent as well as more average individual Canadians pooled their resources and formed broad coalitions to influence the outcome of the election. Businesses provided the financial support into whichever side best represented their interests for the future, and I would hope they would now be able to provide funds to keep Canada together, because it surely must be in their best interests to avoid the uncertainties and other problems that would likely occur in an acrimonious breakup of the country. This Canada Coalition, as I will call it for the lack of a more appropriate name, might also receive financial and other support from the nine provincial governments outside Quebec and could actually be the means by which they could provide a common front in contributing to taking the debate into Quebec itself and not relying on the federal government.

1540

This Canada coalition would act to organize and pay for public debates between federalists and sovereigntists, to distribute federalist materials to Quebec households, to pay for prominent federalists to travel into Quebec for interviews with the news media, to run radio and television and print advertisements advocating federalism and describing its benefits, and otherwise act to advocate federalism and to shift public support in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada behind national unity.

In fact, a group was recently formed in Quebec called Movement 1991 for the purpose of advocating a quicker referendum on Quebec independence. If the separatists are forming these sorts of advocacy groups, we have no choice but to do the same thing if we want to keep Quebec in Canada and if we want to do so on terms that do not weaken our ability and the ability of the federal government to work in the best interests of all Canadians in defending Canadian interests from American interests and otherwise keeping us united.

In 1980 the federalist "no" side of the referendum was headed up by the leader of the provincial opposition, then the Quebec Liberal Party. But if they are the ones calling

for the referendum in two years, who will be left to run the federalist side in Quebec? If we rely on the hope that the first ministers might negotiate a reasonable solution before then, we are fooling ourselves. In addition, the stronger the support is for sovereignty in Quebec, the less room there is for them to negotiate a resolution, so we must go to the heart of the matter ourselves.

Time is short and getting shorter. I do not believe we will have the time to create some form of elected constitutional convention, separate from our elected governments, as some have suggested, because it would have to be organized by government itself and I do not believe any of the first ministers would be willing to forfeit authority over constitutional change. Some sort of change is inevitable and we are all certain of this. We must start taking measures now to save Canada as we know it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Graff. We will have to end there, there being no time left to deal with any questions.

DONALD CLAPPISON

The Chair: I call Donald Clappison.

Mr Clappison: Mr Chairman and members of the committee, it is with a great deal of remembrance, sadness and frustration I realized that this is the same furniture that was here at the time I appeared at the Meech Lake hearings. At the time, my frustration was the regimentation and the manipulation of the Meech Lake process.

My brief will be very short today. I must admit that the nature and the tone of my presentation today will not exactly reveal a Canadian who has given up, but will bear the frustration and the negative aspect of my feelings and the feelings of a great many Canadians. I am making it very brief today, since we are under time restraints, so I will proceed.

Before you categorize the entire presentation as totally negative, it is how many people of English Canada feel, and I do not believe there is time for acrimony between the founding nations. I have been to Quebec, I loved the holiday, I loved the people, but I feel that what we see today is a totally distorted view. We see power and the power side of the issue.

In the minds of many Canadians, the Meech Lake conference provided an opportunity to heal and restore the tenuous relationship between our two founding nations. The procedure demanded open and sincere leadership, a reasonable time frame and the genuine inclusion of public participation. Ignoring these obvious prerequisites, the federal government chose a process to be long remembered for its delay, secrecy, manipulation, acrimony and unwarranted vilification of participants possessing legitimate concerns.

The mishandling of Meech Lake decimated the very public acceptance it was intended to achieve. The nation simply refused to be programmed by political street smarts and a roll of the dice. Consequently, we now find ourselves on the horns of a dilemma, without a sense of leadership, any realistic blueprint or identifiable purity of purpose from those we have chosen to represent us.

The Meech Lake process left Canadians generally mistrustful of pious declarations and shallow prescriptions for

unity. The damaging partisan claim that English Canada had rejected Quebec through the Meech Lake failure has only served to deepen wounds and rekindle hostilities we felt we had overcome. Unfortunately for Canada, there are those still prepared to mix partisan objectives with the wellbeing of our nation, to the peril of future generations on both sides of the debate.

I do not have to remind this committee of the hurriedly organized federal Citizens' Forum set in motion barely in advance of Quebec hearings on sovereignty. The timing alone of this unstructured, costly exercise has generated further cynicism at a time when we are already besieged by a multitude of overwhelming domestic difficulties threatening our survival.

As a people, we daily experience these difficulties, be they the incompetent dismantling of economic investments of yesteryear, the abandonment of jobs and factories to the selfish whim of market forces or the deliberately orchestrated erosion of the very special social sensitivities and gentleness that made us different as a country.

Our cities remain threatened by the foolish persistence of the Young Offenders Act. Violence is allowed to increase while policemen become easy targets for political criticism. New aspects of abortion, new genetic breakthroughs, the increasing number of the elderly and the high cost of health care threaten our future values of human life. To these difficulties, add high interest rates, the value of the dollar, war, recession and violence. As a nation we have a very full plate. Under these circumstances, the current constitutional crisis seems hardly appropriate, but we are in it and it must be resolved.

After urging and threatening English Canadians to make concessions in Meech Lake, the federal government has now shifted its philosophical gears, stating its determination to defend Canada from unreasonable demands of our fellow province.

I submit that if Canada is to be saved, it must be first saved from the hands of the self-serving aspect of our political life and be managed by those who can act independently of their own power base. Our unity will not be restored through vague generalities at midday business luncheons or the opening of discussion kits in a church basement. It is time for genuine leadership, and real leaders, like real men, admit their mistakes, building on restored honesty, not upon the redirection of blame to others.

In 1940 my family's home was situated above the railway lines leading from the north Toronto station to the boats in Halifax and passage to the battlefields of Europe. I can still visualize the trainloads of our finest troops as they enthusiastically waved to everyone in sight. Memorial plaques in countless Canadian churches and institutions bear the names of those who never came back. They fought and laid down their lives for the freedom and enjoyment of those in the country they loved.

The current bickering, threats and ultimatums being imposed on Canadians make us unworthy of the ultimate sacrifice of these men. What then is the solution? The answer, I believe, is reason, fairness, justice and the absence of the meddling influence of power-hungry politicians and media, which increasingly inflames issues.

Reason tells us that there may well be a national divorce. Fairness tells us that the people, and the people alone, without political influence, should be the ones to decide the outcome of this nation. Justice tells us that the terms and consequences would be severe for Quebecers and English Canada alike under certain world trends.

1550

Quebec's past and present benefits from the Canadian Confederation have been many and significant. It is reasonable for English Canadians to be distressed by the lack of positive recognition of this fact on the part of their Quebec counterparts. It is not necessary to list the industries that have been financially endowed by the federal government or government operations relocated to Hull and other sections of Quebec and the financial input into the life and culture of the province.

The unrealistic demands and proposals currently emanating from Quebec beg to be addressed and put into perspective with an element of authority, conviction and integrity, the very qualities of our missing leadership.

With a national debt approaching \$400 billion, English Canadians are not thrilled or impressed by the cost of a bilingual program that daily consumes the equivalent of 45 years' total salary at \$36,000 a year, the lifetime working income of one person to pay for one day. I call that more than a generous contribution to the preservation of Quebec's linguistic heritage, even more generous in view of the restrictive treatment of the English language through Quebec's Bill 178.

Any constitutional agreement is a two-way street. We cannot for ever continue to be the constant provider of accommodations for this process. Measures like Ontario's Bill 8 are perceived by many as falling victim to some form of ever-widening process of gerrymandering. Some would insist that the inclusion of Metropolitan Toronto's 2.2% francophone population under the bilingual umbrella is confirmation of their claim.

Make no mistake, if Quebec opts for sovereignty, I fear it will not be a radically decentralized federation; it will be a divorced state. The belief that the federal government's functions could be almost reduced to debt management and equalization payments is without doubt the most extreme of fantasies.

It appears, however, that the creation of an independent Quebec would precipitate the cessation of public interest and concern in its culture, linguistic programs and employment procedures.

However, I will conclude by stating my belief that most Canadian and Ontario residents sincerely hope that our neighbours in the province of Quebec will divest themselves of the distorted opportunistic options being conveyed to them by those who seek only the acquisition of power, for it is only the harmonious, quiet sharing and enjoyment of this great land that can bring honour and dignity to the memory of those who lie in distant fields.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Clappison, you talk about a vacuum of leadership, but you have taken a very broad brush and said there is no leadership in your opinion at the political

level, there is no leadership at the media. Who do you feel is going to come forward at this very crucial moment?

Mr Clappison: I believe that is our problem; that is the bottom line. In this situation I am more fearful than I ever was by the sight of troops in the streets during the Front de libération du Québec crisis. I believe that this time there will not even be a defence for either side. I feel that the tensions have for partisan reasons, and I say this sadly as an ex-supporter of the government—I feel it is that serious.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: All right; I will leave that. I hope that you have some hopefulness left because it seems strange that you, with so little hopefulness in any process, would come before our committee because it does take preparation and time to do it.

Mr Clappison: Now wait a minute. I believe we need to focus on the real issues of where we are at. We cannot start and work towards any giant problem without having an inventory of what has happened. I believe the problem we face in the future negotiations has stemmed from this fact of redirecting the blame. I believe the blame was the process. I believe it would have been possible to bring people together if it had not been directed towards a confrontation and the final results.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You are thinking there is still room for negotiation, you can now use that word which you did not use?

Mr Clappison: I believe there would be room for negotiation, but I believe it will have to be a negotiation that is sincere, sincerely open to the people and sincere by its nature and substance. I say this because I can truthfully say that I feel this committee today presents a totally different tone than the last time I was here. I am heartened. Perhaps if I had been this exposed to more of this committee and seen it on television more—I have not seen this committee on television—had I seen that, my spirit might have been softened. But I do feel we are in a very difficult stage, we are in a crunch, and the issues seem to be much larger at this time and they will be more difficult to bring together.

REG WHITAKER

The Chair: I invite next Reg Whitaker.

Mr Whitaker: I provided the clerk with a written brief. I am Reg Whitaker. I am a professor of political science at York University. In the limited time available, I would like to address the question of Quebec and the distinct, very real possibility that Quebec will shortly be initiating moves to sovereignty.

I think there has been a somewhat distressing tendency among Ontario spokespersons to avoid facing this reality, and even a tendency to suggest that discussion of this possibility will somehow hasten its realization or give encouragement to those forces in Quebec that wish to separate. I think this is a very serious mistake, leaving open the possibility that Ontario and the rest of Canada outside Quebec will be left without any coherent voice or sense of direction if Quebec does turn down this road, which I believe is now likely.

I think there are only three options available to Canada outside Quebec in the face of the demands that we have already seen from the Allaire commission and which we will soon be seeing from the Bélanger-Campeau commission in Quebec.

Those three options are, first of all, that if we wish to retain Quebec as part of Canada, we have to adopt their first option, which would be what has been called asymmetrical federalism or some form of extreme special status for Quebec. Under this option, Quebec achieves virtual sovereignty by the transfer of a whole series of powers to its own jurisdiction. Yet at the same time, Quebec would continue to send representatives to Ottawa, would continue to make or break Canadian governments as Quebec voters have always done in the past, and Quebec MPs would be making decisions affecting the lives of Canadians outside Quebec which were of little or no interest to their own constituents.

If you look at the Allaire report Canadians would be, I think, rightly outraged at the notion of Quebec obtaining virtual sovereignty while the rest of us were obliged to manage the national debt and to pay equalization to Quebec. It really does not seem to be a reasonable option.

Option two would be a kind of sovereignty-association for all or special status for all. Under this option, all provinces would either be given the same powers given to Quebec or all provinces would be given the option of exercising those powers. I think the result here would be either a federalism so decentralized as to lead to a situation where one really would not see a Canada that was recognizable, or a kind of crazy quilt of a country in which there was no uniformity of treatment and no universality and no national standards.

I think it is no accident that this option has been advocated recently by what I might call neo-conservative economists, who wish to reduce, if not eliminate, the role of government in favour of unregulated market forces. I think a decentralized or patchwork Canada would make impossible the kind of functioning of national and universal social programs such as medicare, which Canadians support very strongly.

If the price to be paid for maintaining national unity, that is Canada with Quebec, under these first two options is unacceptably high, then Ontario must begin to contemplate the possibility of a Canada without Quebec. An ostrich-like avoidance of the problem will not impede its appearance; it will only impair our ability to cope effectively when it happens.

1600

Now I would like very briefly, and I have touched on these in greater detail in the written brief, to talk about three aspects. First of all, economic relationships of Ontario with Quebec, if Quebec were to be independent. Basically what I am suggesting is that perhaps the prospects are not as scary as some people would suggest, that particularly in the era of free trade—even if we may not all particularly like the results of free trade, it is the era of free trade on a broader scale than just North America—I think a great deal could be achieved to maintain the economic relationships between Ontario and Quebec, which are very important to

both Ontario and to Quebec, by simply regulating them through treaty, the sovereign Canada and the sovereign Quebec.

I would suggest, for example, a fundamental treaty which would stipulate the free movement of capital goods and people between the two countries. Other things could be done as well, I think, that would avoid having a whole lot of machinery that would exist as some unaccountable and unrepresentative level of government to regulate the relations. This has sometimes been seen as sovereignty-association. I think a lot of it could be done basically by treaty and it would be to the advantage of everybody to do so.

The second point is about the political ramifications of a Canada without Quebec. Here it is obvious that if Quebec does leave, Ontario has half the population. I suppose that a superficial kind of Ontario-first mentality might say that, "That is wonderful." I think a little bit of reflection indicates that the inevitable reaction in western and Atlantic Canada should convince us that this is a problem, not an advantage.

But I think the problem could be solved by reforming the national institutions of government to offer more effective regional representation, which I think would be a good thing in any event in a federation and is something that has been very high on the agenda of western Canadians for some time. I think really Ontario should adopt the same statesmanlike position which successive premiers from John Robarts to David Peterson took in the past in making concessions to Quebec to keep the federation together. This time the concessions would be made to fellow English Canadians and aimed at keeping Canada, without Quebec, together.

Ontario is really in a pivotal position to make Canada without Quebec work better and more harmoniously. Indeed it offers a lot of possibilities for a better system of government, one that would be closer to the people. I think a lot of the reforms that have been advocated in the past would have been impossible to achieve so long as the Quebec question has always been at the forefront of the Constitution agenda. If Quebec is removed, it does open up a lot of possibilities.

I should just mention in passing that I think it is important that Ontario make its intentions known in advance. We all heard the Prime Minister make a speech here in Toronto a couple of weeks ago, or last week, in which he said that if Quebec left, westerners and Maritimers would be dominated and exploited by Ontario with its population advantage. I think Ontario should indicate that national unity is not served by dividing Canadians against Canadians and make it clear that Ontario would act in the interests of the country as a whole, whether that country includes or excludes Quebec.

Finally the last point I want to make, and it is an unavoidable one I suppose if one is contemplating the possibility, perhaps the likelihood, of Quebec leaving, is the question of bilingualism and the linguistic rights of the francophone minority in Ontario. It is of course very hard to see how, in a Canada without Quebec, bilingualism would be retained on the basis that it is now.

On the other hand, it might very well be considered in the interests—I do not know—of Ontario to make, and indeed in advance, some suggestion that in fact the historic rights of francophones in this province, as probably in New Brunswick where there would be a similar case, would be protected whatever the national situation would be. At least, it is certainly owed to the francophone population that some advance idea is given as to what the position of Ontario will be in the light of these changes.

In conclusion, my main point is that if change of this kind comes, it will come probably very quickly and will create a very serious crisis throughout the country, and that it is much better to contemplate the options now, rather than try to avoid them. A calm, rational analysis of the option of Quebec sovereignty should not discount the costs and risks, but it should also point out that as in all crisis situations, dangers coincide with opportunities. Ontario should consider now how to maximize the opportunities and to minimize the dangers while time permits.

Mr Malkowski: I found your presentation very interesting. Do you feel Ontario should establish a report similar to, say, what happened in Quebec with the Allaire report, simply to outline what our objectives would be if the situation comes to a separation?

Mr Whitaker: I think that would be an excellent idea. Yes, I would approve of that very much.

Mr Winninger: You presented a scenario here where Quebec would become sovereign and the rest of Canada would exist in parallel in a sovereign state. I wonder if there is a legitimate concern, however, that if Quebec were to separate from the rest of Canada, it would propel the forces of fragmentation further. On our travels we have heard from the north and how some people in the north would actually want to form a separate province in the north. We have seen the resurgence of regionalism in the Reform Party out west and it has also gained a toe-hold here in Ontario.

I am just wondering, if we see Quebec separate, whether we will not see a lot more fragmentation, rather the kind of cohesion that you would confer upon a national government that would be sensitive to regional issues which you have suggested might be more likely to occur without Quebec than with Quebec in the fold. I wonder if you could comment on that.

Mr Whitaker: Obviously that is a danger, although on the other hand, if the only thing holding the rest of Canada together were Quebec, it is not a very good advertisement for what this country is outside Quebec.

I think there is a much stronger sense of nationalism that exists in all parts of the country. You mentioned the Reform Party in the west and it is quite striking that the Reform Party really does not represent, I think, so much regionalism as the desire to be, as they say, in, not out, and they see that in terms of reforming the national institutions of government, as I was suggesting would be possible and desirable and necessary, particularly once Quebec is gone, if it goes, to better reflect the regional interests at the centre.

It seems to me that is really why it is so incumbent in Ontario, if this comes about, to take the lead in refashioning a

new Canada that would begin from the premise that we should stay together. I do not think it is in anybody's interests, certainly not little breakaway provinces and certainly not joining the United States where the political clout would be far less than it would be in a Canada even without Quebec.

1610

This is an opportunity to fashion the country in a way that it has been very hard to do so long as there has really been a Quebec-driven constitutional agenda. It seems to me that one of the characteristics of a Quebec-driven constitutional agenda—I think we are seeing it right now—is that Quebec's concern is always to, for example, if you are talking about the distribution of powers between the federal and provincial governments, Quebec can only see it going one way. That is fine; I understand it from their point of view.

But if we were really, rationally to look at the BNA Act and the distribution of powers in 1867—that was a long time ago and it is a very different world in the late 20th century—we might say, "Let us rationally reallocate these powers." Some would go down to the provinces, undoubtedly, that are now being exercised by the federal government, but some should probably go up to the federal government, and that cannot happen as long as Quebec is driving the agenda. I think there are opportunities. Nobody likes to see a country break up, but what I am suggesting is, there are all kinds of possibilities that are there if that does happen.

Mr Offer: In your presentation, you have spoken about a number of different options, all of which are premised on some form of the province acquiring increased powers from the central government in one way or another. I am wondering if you have directed your mind to some of the scenarios where that is not the underlying premise, where the premise is not a province acquiring more powers, more responsibilities from the central government but rather the provinces acquiring a greater say in the powers exercised by the central government. In other words, not so much, "I need this particular responsibility as a province which is now exercised by the central government," but rather, "Because of regional interests, for a whole variety of reasons, I need, as a province, a greater say in how those particular powers are exercised." I am wondering if you have thought about that particular aspect and what scenarios may unfold from that.

Mr Whitaker: Again, those options I suggested were options, I think, that are available in response to what is coming from Quebec. What I am really trying to get at is that in some ways we should try to break out of simply responding to Quebec, which does, I think, push things always in the direction of more powers to the province and which may not always be in the interests of the rest of the country which does not have the same kind of reasons for doing that. Indeed, many provinces, not including Ontario but other provinces, are too poor to really handle that kind of devolution of powers and it would not be in their interests at all, Atlantic Canada in particular.

I would lay a great deal of emphasis on the importance of restructuring the national institutions to reflect the re-

gional or provincial interests at the centre. I think that is very important. I think there are a number of things that in the late 20th-century world of economic globalization and so on really do have to be exercised from the centre; things such as, for example, environmental protection and international agreements that try to cope with the effect of pollution on the global environment, and the need to have a strong central government, not just here but in other countries, to actually enforce those agreements at the centre. At the same time, certainly there is need to have representation of the different parts of the country, especially a country as diverse as this, so that it is not simply dominated by one province and one set of interests. I agree with that.

Ms Churley: Your last statement will allow me to change my question, actually, because you essentially answered the question I was going to ask. You mention environmental protection. That is of interest to me, and in fact that gets us to, I think, a central point in terms of the Liberal Quebec report. It suggested that the environment be one area that Quebec would keep within its jurisdiction. I believe that is an area that is lacking on the whole in this whole discussion, how and who decides where these very important issues end up, and I would like to hear your comment on that, given that the Liberal Party of Quebec is saying it would like to keep the environment within its own jurisdiction at the same time as the environmentalists across the country right now, I believe, are trying to centralize so that we have more uniform regulation for environmental protection.

Mr Whitaker: This is just one more example that leads me to think that Quebec sovereignty is inevitable and probably a good thing for both Quebec and Canada. I think one has to understand why Quebecers are so concerned. It is not just the Liberals, I think, and we will certainly see that from the Bélanger-Campeau commission. Everybody says this in Quebec and a whole host of other areas. You really have to see this in the context of a people who see themselves as a nation and simply want to have the requisite powers vested in their government to do all these things nation-states do.

On the other hand, in the rest of the country there simply is not that kind of sentiment attaching to the provinces, nor should there be. And there is a sense, certainly in the case of environmental protection, that it is not even rational to limit this to provincial jurisdictions. You have to cope with it on an international level, but, as I was just saying a moment ago to Mr Offer, you cannot even cope with it on an international level if you do not have the kind of machinery in your own central government that can enforce international agreements and carry out the kind of actions that are required in order to make that work.

I really do think there are two different agendas that exist in Quebec and in the rest of the country which are really not compatible in many ways.

CLAY DERSTINE

The Chair: I call Clay Derstine.

M. Derstine : Je voudrais assurer qu'il y a parmi vous une copie de notre présentation. J'aurais pu vous parler pour deux heures et on m'a informé que je n'avais que dix

minutes. Alors je vais faire la présentation dans la langue majoritaire afin de laisser un peu d'espace pour répondre aux questions.

I assume we are all here to try to patch together an alternative vision of our country, a vision which has the power to compete for the support of all Canadians, a vision to replace the old Canada, which is about to break in pieces. It is past time that this be done. In our village world, some powers must be delegated from our anachronistic nation-states to world organizations, and some centralized sovereignty must devolve to our unique provinces, cities and neighbourhoods. This metamorphosis, this amending of the old rigidities, this reapportioning of sovereignties can be creative and a healthy process if we insist that our collective vision be empowered with imagination.

I am here this afternoon to plead with you not to envisage a diminished Canada, a barebones skeleton, a lowest common denominator. I am here to plead with you, to implore you to help create a society which will enhance the quality of life shared by its members, to foresee a country setting fresh common perspectives and revived national standards. Not how much less can we put up with, but how much dare we expect? Let us build on our strengths, not subtract from them. Let us attain to splendour.

1620

In this vein, I am here this afternoon as an educator to propose one aspect of this enhanced vision. Let us begin education, schooling, in our province and in our country immediately after our children are out of diapers, around two years old, as do advanced countries all over the world, in Europe, in Africa, in the East. This breakthrough would solve once and for all the ever more critical day care crisis, which is now putting all but the children of the very poor and the rich at risk.

As women continue their fight for fair opportunities, this initiative would redefine fathering and mothering. For the one in 10 of our children who now require special education, early assessment and early treatment would change their lives miraculously. From two to five years old, when children have an optimum talent to acquire languages almost effortlessly, we could provide, for all our children, fluency in both languages of this country and at least one language of its communities. We could provide fluency not by verb declensions and vocabulary lists but naturally, by means of songs and dances and games, all before the child enters the traditional elementary cycle. It is a revolution in education to be able to time the delivery of the stimulation to the child's maximum capacity to absorb that material.

This splendid solution would build on the heritage of languages now alive in our bicultural and mosaic Canada. It would rid us once and for all of antiquated terms such as "mother tongue," and it would make us redefine what we meant by the perils of assimilation and the achievements of immersion. By graduation, Canadian children would be uniquely equipped to compete and contribute in the new competitions of our village world. Splendour indeed.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you for your presentation. One point you made strikes me as very interesting: one out

of every 10 children now requires special education, and early assessment and early treatment will change their lives miraculously. Are you using a medical model in terms of identifying these children? Could you expand on what you meant by that statement?

Mr Derstine: When our kids go to school, it takes them several years, the way it is now, before they are finally identified as having some specific problem, and then we go through a procedure called IPRC, where that problem is tried to be pinned down, and then once we pin a label on the kid's forehead, it takes us a number of years more before we treat what is behind that label. As a result, many kids suffer a process they would not need to suffer if they were identified from two years on in early childhood education.

In France, for instance, where they take for granted that school starts at two, the kids are identified earlier, they are treated before they are scarred by the whole process, and the huge, expensive bureaucracy of special education is cut down immeasurably, and the anguish to the children is cut down inconceivably.

Mr Malkowski: That is fine. For example, for deaf French-speaking children in Ontario, there are not enough resources to provide a French sign language environment. There are a number of resources lacking. What might be your solution to this problem? Do you have any creative solutions?

Mr Derstine: Once again, all I can say is the earlier they find a diagnosis and the earlier they find treatment the better they are at accommodating themselves to what is being diagnosed.

Mr Beer: We have heard some discussion around the options that face the country, and people looking at different sorts of scenarios and then suggesting that perhaps the separation of Quebec, if that is really what it wants to do, is perhaps the best route and we should try to sit down and in as mature a way as possible work out that separation. I sense from your presentation it is still your hope that somehow we can find our way through all of this, but as somebody who I know has been involved in working with French- and English-speaking Canadians over a great deal of time—a lot of your ideas, which we have worked with over the last 25 years, sought to bring about greater understanding between English- and French-speaking Canadians, the development of various bilingualism programs and the like. If indeed Quebec says, "That's nice, we think you're nice people, but frankly we see ourselves as a nation and at this point in time we want to move that other step and have good relationships but we want to be an independent country," what kind of impact do you think that has on the kinds of things you and others within the country have been fighting for, and how does that relate to the kind of spirit that is in your presentation today? Do you think we will still see in the "rest of Canada" an openness to linguistic rights or even to multiculturalism or do you think we can just avoid having to face all of those issues?

Mr Derstine: I figure there is an urgency that we begin the kind of process I am talking about, and I hope I will manage to convince the current government as soon

as possible of that urgency. One of the reasons I am here is in order to begin that quest. At the same time, if that initiative came from Ontario to make language facility one of the major keys in what it meant to be a Canadian, and certainly if it helped solve the feelings of alienation among so many of our new Canadians if we incorporated as well their capacity to use one of their home tongues at school in order to encourage fluency, in order to produce at the other end Canadians who could go out into our village world and function in all the languages of the world, it would give us that kind of identity that so many of us are scuttling around trying to find.

I have tried to be as positive as possible. Certainly, I am fearful that if Quebec did separate it would move back into a ghetto of unilingualism for a certain amount of time, and I would hate to see that. I think the tendencies we noticed in Prescott-Russell a while back are to be feared. To me, there is no question that one is richer with another tongue rather than poorer. It is a consummation devoutly to be wished that Quebec would see an openness, but if Quebec leaves, it would still to me be an option that would weld us together with the west, where they already have German-English schools and Ukrainian-English schools that fit into their programs. I would figure this would be a way of adding another dimension to their wish to remain with us.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Derstine.

1630

DIALOGUE CANADA, TORONTO CHAPTER

The Chair: I invite Jeffrey Graham, Anne-Marie Caron-Réaume, Tom McQuiston from Dialogue Canada, the Toronto chapter. Go ahead.

Mr Graham: Thank you, Mr Chairman and members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, for the opportunity to appear before you this afternoon. My name is Jeff Graham and my colleagues and co-presenters are Anne-Marie Caron-Réaume and Tom McQuiston.

We are appearing this afternoon on behalf of the Toronto chapter of Dialogue Canada. Dialogue Canada is a non-profit, non-partisan group of individuals from across Canada who have come together as a result of the failure of the Meech Lake accord ratification, having a common desire to promote tolerance and understanding within Canada's pluralistic society.

The catalyst for the group is a professor at the University of Ottawa, Professor John Trent. Copies of background information on Dialogue Canada have been circulated, or are in fact being circulated as I speak to you, along with a paper Professor Trent has written on the issue of Canadian values.

One of Canada's greatest gifts to the world is its capacity to achieve consensus through tolerance and mutual understanding. Throughout its history, Canada has developed creative strategies to encourage different ethnic, linguistic and regional groups to live together in relative harmony. As a result, Canada has in the eyes of many in our global community achieved that exalted status unequalled anywhere else in the world, a truly peaceable kingdom.

In recent decades, Canada has become an increasingly complex society. Large numbers of newcomers have joined us from regions of the world traditionally unrepresented in Canadian society. While these new Canadians have made the challenge of building national consensus more difficult in the short term, they are often Canada's proudest citizens, for they appreciate better than most of us what a wonderful country Canada is by comparison to most other countries in the world.

The failure to ratify the Meech Lake accord this past summer represented for many of us the clearest evidence to date that our cherished ability to achieve national consensus was at risk and that urgent steps had to be taken to reassert the importance of tolerance and mutual understanding as we prepare to make far-reaching changes to our Constitution. The members of Dialogue Canada believe that if Canada is to thrive as we enter the 21st century we must find ways of understanding the needs and aspirations of all Canadians so that we may find creative and dynamic ways to ensure that all Canadians feel proud to be Canadian.

The process of constitutional reform in which we now find ourselves should be understood as a great opportunity for all Canadians. Far from something to fear, it should be seen as an opportunity for communities within this country which have felt disadvantaged to achieve a new place in the federation.

The catalyst for change has been the efforts of the government of the province of Quebec to achieve a new role in Canada which permits French-speaking Canadians in the province to rededicate themselves to Canada. Our native communities and western Canadians, among others, should be particularly grateful that this process of change has been accelerated. In the final analysis, we must ensure that no Canadian feels he is prejudiced in this process. We can all win if the process is well managed in a non-partisan manner by people with a broad and tolerant vision of our country.

There is nothing to fear from the process of change. That is not to say that those who feel threatened can be ignored. The opponents to change are for the most part acting out of either ignorance or fear for their economic livelihoods. We must not allow these voices of intolerance to control the political agenda. At the same time, we must take steps to ensure that those who feel threatened by change are indeed protected.

The failure to ratify the Meech accord was first and foremost a failure of our elected leaders to build a national consensus on the need for change and the content of change. There would, I expect, have been far less criticism today about the process if the agreement reached had reflected a national consensus. This committee, similar committees in other provinces and the Spicer commission are all contributing to the necessary process of building a national consensus. However, we must not consider that this process will come to an end once the various reports of these committees are tabled. The process of constitutional change must continue to be open and participatory. Neither the provincial nor the federal government can adequately represent all Canadians in this process. There must be a

seat at the table for each of the communities which make up the country. Only in this way can we ensure that the changes to the Constitution ultimately reflect the truly agreed upon values of a national consensus.

Overcoming the sentiment held by so many Canadians that all provinces must be treated equally is in my judgement key to the successful conclusion of this process of constitutional reform. In my view, the premise is based on an honest misunderstanding of current constitutional realities and a misapplication of the honoured Canadian value which insists that no one should be treated better than anybody else. In my view, one of our great challenges, if we are to be successful in this process, is that we must help Canadians understand that all provinces are not alike. First, they have never been. Second, many of the existing federal programs are designed to redress inequalities in resources among provinces. Third, there are more efficient ways to help the small and weak than by treating both big and small the same. We must help Canadians understand that all provinces and regions in this country enjoy a special status in this country and that we are better off seeking to build a flexible and dynamic set of arrangements between the provinces, the regions and the federal governments than trying to fit everyone into the same mold.

Frankly, I am ashamed of my fellow Canadians, including some members of the media who should know better, who suggest that if Quebec is not willing to accept the terms dictated by the rest of the country, it should go. How un-Canadian are such views.

After 123 years one would think that more English-speaking Canadians would appreciate just how vital and dynamic a part of Canada the province of Quebec has become. We in English Canada are poorer for having largely ignored the richness of French Canadian culture—its writers, its playwrights, its film makers and musicians. We have in our midst a world-class cultural community that most Canadians are not able to appreciate. Why in heaven's name would we as Canadians want to deprive our children of the opportunity of living as Canadians in Montreal or Quebec City, visiting the Laurentians, the Gaspé or the Lac-Saint-Jean region? Do we not understand the tremendous resource the French language can be to all English Canadians in pursuing career opportunities in and outside of Canada? How could any of you, who are playing the important role in this debate, explain to your children how you gave up fully one quarter of their heritage because of your inability to accommodate the legitimate aspirations of French Canadians?

I will now briefly comment on three of the questions raised in your public discussion paper; my colleagues will comment on the others.

First, "How can we secure our future in the international economy?" All Canadians must understand how important our ability to compete internationally is to our continued economic prosperity. There are few countries in the world so dependent on international trade. Neither we nor our elected leaders can afford to misunderstand the impact of the doctrine of comparative economic advantage.

We must ensure that there is an efficient allocation of resources in this country between the private and public

sectors. We cannot afford to waste money on government spending. Overlapping or conflicting federal government programs and those of the provinces can no longer be tolerated by Canadians. The government must be an efficient partner in the quest for the economic wellbeing of all Canadians.

My colleague Tom McQuiston will discuss the role of Quebec in Canada. I will now briefly discuss what is the place of the west, the north and the Maritimes. Each region of this country is a special and vital part of this country. We must ensure that our existing national institutions respond to the challenges and needs of each region. One cannot legislate an end to regional alienation. An elected Senate with a redefined role may not necessarily accomplish this objective—that is to say, to eliminate regional alienation—any better than a chamber of provincial representatives or the body as currently constituted. One must not confuse the natural tensions between governments of virtually co-equal status—that is to say, the federal government and the provincial governments in this country—with the need to ensure that national policies truly reflect a national consensus. In this regard, the media bear an important responsibility in helping Canadians in each region understand the special contributions made by other Canadians in building this country.

Finally, what should Ontario want? Ontario should want all Canadians, all Canadian provincial governments and all regions of Canada to be excited about this country's future and willing to work together for the collective good. Ontario should want a constitutional framework which ensures an effective allocation of resources between governments and the private sector and among governments themselves. It should want a level playing field for the distribution of economic opportunities within Canada. It should want an opportunity to contribute its linguistic, racial and cultural diversity to building strong national institutions. As the most populous and economically powerful province, Ontario has no choice but to play a leadership role in resolving the key questions of our time, the redefinition of the status of Quebec and other regions within Canada and the status of our native people.

Thank you for your attention.

1640

Mme Caron-Réaume : En tant que partisane de Dialogue Canada et Franco-Ontarienne de souche, je vous soumets aujourd'hui ma liste de valeurs et de politiques que le Canada et l'Ontario auraient mérite à conserver en ce moment critique de notre histoire. Ces idées sont basées sur mes expériences de la vie et sur les discussions que j'ai eues avec les membres de Dialogue Canada et mes collègues de travail. Je voudrais commencer en partageant l'histoire de ma mère, histoire qui marqua profondément ma vie.

Ma mère est née en 1900 dans une famille pauvre de la région de l'Est. Quand elle a eu à fréquenter l'école, elle n'avait pas de choix : il n'y avait que l'école de langue anglaise. Elle ne connaissait pas la langue d'enseignement ou la langue de communication de l'école. Aucun ajustement n'était fait dans le programme pour elle et ces jeunes

francophones qui avaient à acquérir les connaissances et à se créer des amitiés dans une langue qui leur était étrangère.

Dans une telle situation, l'humiliation était constante : elle sentait qu'elle était dans un état d'infériorité par rapport au groupe majoritaire anglophone. Ce n'est qu'à l'âge de seize ans, quand une tante lui donna l'occasion de se préparer à l'enseignement dans une école modèle de Windsor, que ma mère a pu apprendre à bien lire et à bien écrire dans sa langue maternelle. Devenue enseignante dans une école rurale où tous les élèves étaient Franco-Ontariens, ma mère continuait à sentir la menace face à sa langue et à sa culture. Le Règlement 17 interdisait le français comme langue d'enseignement et comme langue de communication.

Quelle est la situation pour les francophones en 1991 ? La promulgation des langues officielles au niveau fédéral et de la Loi 8 en Ontario a donné l'occasion aux citoyens d'employer le français ou l'anglais quand ils communiquent avec les préposés des bureaux désignés des institutions gouvernementales. L'article 23 de la Charte canadienne des droits et libertés garantit aux minoritaires francophones ou anglophones de toutes les provinces le droit à l'éducation dans leur langue maternelle. De plus, la désignation de l'Ontario comme province officiellement bilingue serait désirable.

En tant que francophone de l'Ontario, je commence à sentir que je suis citoyenne à part entière, que ma langue et ma culture sont respectées, que j'ai quelque chose de précieux à contribuer au bien-être de la province et du pays. Dans ma vision du Canada, il importe que tous les minoritaires du pays jouissent du même sentiment d'appartenance. Malgré l'échec du Lac Meech, malgré les voix discordantes de la bigoterie et du racisme, malgré le désir de nombreux citoyens du Québec de quitter le Canada, il est urgent que l'Ontario et les autres provinces du Canada réaffirment les valeurs fondamentales de partage, de tolérance, de respect, d'acceptation de la diversité et de l'équité. Si on se limite au domaine de l'éducation pour illustrer ces valeurs, qu'est-ce que cela veut dire ?

Afin de donner les chances égales aux francophones et aux anglophones minoritaires, il faut des arrangements spéciaux qui assurent la qualité des programmes et services livrés dans la langue et la culture privilégiées. Que dire des peuples autochtones qui cherchent à passer leur langue et leur culture à leurs enfants ? Pour que ce peuple puisse évoluer et contribuer à la société, il doit se sentir respecté et jouir des droits acquis par les deux autres peuples fondateurs du pays. Un système d'éducation qui encourage le sens positif de l'identité, qui met en évidence des valeurs propres à la culture par les programmes d'études contribuerait à la richesse du pays, tant au niveau des ressources humaines qu'au niveau du partage des valeurs fondamentales. Par exemple, les peuples autochtones ont beaucoup à partager quant au respect de l'environnement physique.

Que dire des élèves de minorités visibles et de minorités ethnoculturelles qui arrivent au Canada en très grand nombre en tant qu'immigrants ou réfugiés ? Lorsque le Canada décide d'accueillir les gens de cultures et de races différentes, il s'engage aux niveaux financier et humain à les intégrer à une société qui valorise leur apport. On doit

s'assurer de mettre en place des programmes éducatifs et les services de base pour que les nouveaux arrivés deviennent des citoyens qui connaissent les lois et partagent les valeurs canadiennes. En même temps, tel qu'énoncé dans les politiques sur le multiculturalisme, il importe que la langue et la culture de chaque élève soient valorisées puisque l'estime de soi et l'identité en dépendent. Le programme des langues d'origine est une contribution importante que le pays devrait conserver. Le maintien de l'héritage linguistique des divers groupes ethnoculturels enrichit les individus et le pays.

Deux autres clientèles minoritaires désavantagées ont été dépitées par les institutions gouvernementales : l'enfance en difficulté et les jeunes filles. Des ajustements dans les programmes au point de vue langue et culture sont aussi importants dans ces cas, afin d'assurer un traitement équitable et l'élimination des barrières qui pourraient empêcher leur participation entière à la vie de la société. Les jeunes sourds ont le droit de choisir la langue de communication qui leur convient le mieux. Les élèves souffrant d'anomalies physiques ou de problèmes socioaffectifs ont droit au soutien de base. La langue et la culture de l'école se doivent de respecter la contribution égale des filles et des garçons : l'absence de stéréotypes sexuels, la protection contre l'agression physique ou la violence psychologique sont de mise.

Si on accepte qu'aucun groupe n'est supérieur à l'autre et donc qu'aucun groupe dominant dicte sa volonté à un groupe subalterne dans notre pays, cela veut dire que le Canada est contre le racisme, le sexisme, la bigoterie et l'oppression. Cela veut dire que le Canada est pour le respect de la dignité de la personne, l'acceptation et l'appréciation de la diversité, la promotion de mesures spéciales pour obtenir des résultats égaux pour les groupes minoritaires et la promotion de l'ouverture d'esprit qui encourage l'interaction avec l'autre sur un pied d'égalité.

Les valeurs fondamentales de partage, de tolérance, de respect, d'acceptation de la diversité et de l'équité seraient donc à la base de l'identité canadienne.

Ce canevas de valeurs que je propose favoriserait les façons multiples de voir et de résoudre les problèmes et les conflits, le travail visant un but commun accompli en collaboration avec d'autres qui ont des antécédents différents et la mise à profit de la technologie pour améliorer la communication aux niveaux national et international.

Ce canevas de valeurs appliquées au monde de l'éducation et généralisées aux diverses institutions gouvernementales du pays assurera que l'histoire de bigoterie vécue par ma mère ne se répète pas et que tous les minoritaires jouiront d'un sentiment d'appartenance au Canada.

Mr McQuiston: I wish to address two questions from the committee's public discussion paper: first of all, question 6, "What is Quebec's future in Canada?" and, second, question 3, "What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?"

Members of Dialogue Canada have no difficulty in recognizing the distinctiveness of Quebec society and the essential part that Quebec has played in providing Canada with its distinctive national character in North America.

We admire the revolutionary and the progressive steps taken by Quebec in the last 30 years in the field of politics, economics, education and the arts, steps which have made Quebec a productive and a dynamic society and have won it international recognition. We regret, however, that within Canada itself, and after 123 years of Confederation, the two dominant linguistic groups still exist as two solitudes, living for the most part in ignorance one of another. This situation reflects the profound failure of our educational systems and of our national media.

Nevertheless, up to the present Canada has shown itself to be a society capable of providing both a remarkable degree of personal liberty and a high standard of living for its citizens. Canada is a vast country with a relatively small population. To entertain the idea of Canada without Quebec is to accept the loss of 25% of our population and a corresponding weakening of our capacity to develop effectively the very abundant resources of this land.

Without Quebec we would face the prospect of an association of regions heavily unbalanced economically, politically and demographically by Ontario, resulting in continuing instability and a decrease in our standard of living.

1650

Our hope is that the national integrity of Canada can be maintained and that the creativity and the energy of the Québécois will continue to play a significant role in building our common Canadian future.

Regarding question 3 and the roles of the federal and provincial governments, we recognize that the present constitutional debate does not focus exclusively on the Quebec agenda. The problems of Confederation and the solutions to them reflect the needs and must address the concerns of all provinces.

Since 1867 new areas of jurisdiction have emerged that could not have been anticipated at that time, such as the advances in science and technology and the need to protect national health and so on. Along with two world wars and an economic depression, these have brought about changes and distortions in the original division of powers that have caused tension and frustration between the central government and the provinces. Overlapping jurisdictions today result in the duplication of services and the growth of sophisticated and very costly bureaucracies. The division of powers needs to be redefined, and terminology such as "peace, order and good government" and "property and civil rights" require clarification, with powers of the central government required to be broad enough to maintain Canada's position on the international scene and to establish national standards concerning, for example, the environment, health care and post-secondary education. A simple monetary union between Quebec and Canada is not enough to serve the best interests of all Canadians.

The central government's function of distributing equalization payments based on the principle of fairness is needed to maintain a measure of equality between the provinces.

National institutions must reflect not only the economic interests of people but their emotional and cultural needs as well. Understanding between the founding linguistic

groups in the country is dependent upon the vitality of a national broadcasting system.

The adjustment of federal power should be guided by the desirability of freeing up provincial and local initiatives. The recent agreement between Ottawa and Quebec on the question of immigration may provide a model for future concessions to such initiatives.

The present constitutional impasse is both a challenge and an opportunity. Dependency towards disintegration can be reversed only by the creation of a more effective structure for federalism. We believe that Canadians lack neither the will nor the political ingenuity to make whatever constitutional arrangements are necessary to accommodate Quebec within the federal system, but at the same time satisfying those who wish to maintain a viable central government.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You have certainly come to us with many Canadian perspectives. You have brought a paper from Ottawa, which I am very happy about, to Toronto that was presented in Sackville, New Brunswick. Are you the same group that we heard from in Sudbury? Is it Dialogue Canada?

Mr Graham: Dialogue Canada. I was informed by one of your clerks that you heard a presentation from a Dialogue Canada group. It is quite possible that it was the Sudbury chapter.

The Chair: It was the Sudbury chapter.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you say a little bit to us about the other centres that you find activity in, your membership, and some of the activities that you are involved in?

Mr Graham: It is a very young organization. As I noted, it grew out of the events of last summer and the hard work of Professor Trent and a number of his friends and colleagues in Ottawa. We have no funds. We do not have resources.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You are trying to get funds.

Mr Graham: There are in excess of 300 individuals who subscribe to the membership. In this area we have a mailing list in excess of 50. We have, since the fall, been organizing monthly meetings which have really been a sense of therapy for those of us who come and have a chance to talk. We have invited people from—actually, we had a journalist come and speak to us about his views on the issues. We are going to be meeting with people in the Portuguese social services community centre to say a little bit about what their issues and concerns are. It is really meant to be an ongoing effort for those of us who do not pretend to have a sense of all the issues and the perspectives to better understand what some of the people's concerns are.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you for spending your time in meaningful dialogue with us and with others.

Mr Bisson: As was said, we heard from the group from Sudbury, we have heard from you. Do you see any hope?

Mr Graham: Oh, I think there is enormous hope. There is absolutely no reason why you, this group here, or others cannot find a solution to the challenges that are

there. I mean, they are clearly daunting. They have befuddled Canadian leaders for the past 30 years, or at least certainly the issues as far as Quebec is concerned, but as long as there is a common will—and there most certainly is a common will among the people of Canada—to find solutions to these issues, there is nothing that has been said either in Quebec or in the rest of the country, even by those who are the most radical, that one cannot sit down and find not only a compromise but effective and meaningful solutions for the future. So by all means, you are to be congratulated, the government of this province is to be congratulated by saying the things that it has publicly, and we will all be watching very carefully as you move forward.

Mr Bisson: Thank you very much and keep up the good work.

The Chair: For the information of the members of the committee, we do have three additional presentations that we need to deal with this afternoon, and that will be end of the session. I realize that is going to take us over the time we had planned, but for various reasons the groups and the individual need to be heard this afternoon. I will ask them to be as brief as they can.

Mr Amber: Before you start, Mr Chairman, we came down here an hour ahead of your committee meeting to try to get on the end of your list if people did not show up, and it is cavalier treatment to allow people, particularly this group here, who came wandering in just about three quarters of an hour ago and give them the chance to speak and deny us. You just made Quebec's case, because I can understand its point of view now, completely, of how things are done in Canada.

The Chair: All right, sir. Let me just say for the benefit of the people who are in the audience that the individual and the groups that we are adding are not people who have simply showed up. There was some confusion, I guess, in whether they were supposed to have been scheduled or not, and that is why we are hearing the individuals. We do not, unfortunately, have time today to be able to deal with people who have simply come here hoping to be heard.

We will have another day back in Toronto on the 28th, and we are in fact going to be dealing later on with a report from the subcommittee of this committee to the full committee dealing with a process to accommodate additional speakers, both on the 28th and on 1 March in Toronto because of the additional requests. We will not be able to do any more than that at this point. I am sorry, I am just going to have to carry on with the speakers that we have on the list for this afternoon.

Mr Valleau: This gentleman is perturbed by his situation. We were planning to help you, Mr Chairman, by suggesting that we could, as long as we were guaranteed that we would appear at a later meeting, be postponed.

The Chair: I am sorry; who are you, sir?

Mr Valleau: I am speaking for Science for Peace.

The Chair: Oh, well, that is fine. If you are willing to do that, we can. However, the problem that we have with the gentleman who spoke is that my understanding is that he simply did come asking to be heard. My concern is that

if we open it up in that way to people who are here, then it would be incumbent upon us to open it up to anyone else who is here as well. What I am saying is that we need to be as fair as we can to everyone concerned on that issue, so if it is just the one gentleman I would be quite happy to do that and switch you with your organization if you are offering that. Maybe that is something that some of our people in the back could help us with in the meantime.

CHRIS NAIR

The Chair: I would like to proceed with Mr Nair at this point.

M. Nair : Merci, Monsieur le Président. À l'heure où l'Europe s'unit, à l'heure où le mur de Berlin s'écroule et les communistes s'évanouissent, on voit très mal que le Québec, si on doit avoir affaire avec le gouvernement du Québec, en particulier la province de Québec, veut se dissocier du gouvernement du Canada. Je dois vous rappeler, Monsieur le Président, que ce n'est pas la faute des Canadiens anglais, ce n'est pas la faute des Québécois, c'est la faute de notre gouvernement actuel, le gouvernement conservateur.

I would like here to say that we do not like to see Quebec separate, but we must recognize and accept the verdict of the Québécois, of the government of Quebec and the people of Quebec if they choose to separate.

This government, the government of Ontario, has gone right to the USSR to crown the independence of other republics. The United States has pressured the government of Gorbachev to assure that republics over there be independent. How can we now, in a democratic country like ours, not accept that one province that feels it is mature enough to be separated and not grant it independence? Sure, it is going to be painful, but are they not mature enough to take their decision in their own hands? Yes, they are mature enough to take the decision in their own hands. They have all the resources possible, they have the knowledge, they have the knowhow, they have the territory.

1700

Yes, we have to consider about others. At that time, if they want to separate, Canada has to take a hard look about its citizens in Montreal, in Quebec precisely, the same thing like the government of Quebec had a hard look at when it invaded the reserve band in Kahnawake. They sent the police. Should we be prepared also to defend our fellow Canadians in the province of Quebec with the same armed forces that they used to do what they did to the Mohawks in the bands? Are we ready for that?

Let me move from that. I have some recommendations to make now, based on this knowledge. On the new Canada, I would suggest to the committee that because of the latest problem we had with the Senate, some of them were suggesting that the Senate was not valid, was not constitutionally elected and so on. They wanted an elected Senate. I am suggesting here that all judges be not appointed except those in the Supreme Court; all judges should be elected. By this they will ensure that everybody has the same rights. All the judges that will be elected to the Supreme Court should come from the other courts, and in

those courts the judges should be elected like the same thing in the United States.

I am fed up with the questions of everybody who comes here in this province or in this country claiming their patriotic feelings to their original countries. We lack that sense of patriotism in this country.

Je recommande au comité qu'il peut avoir certaines mesures, de prendre les dispositions nécessaires afin que ces Canadiens comme moi — on prête serment à notre pays pour promouvoir notre sens de patriotisme. Et cela doit commencer dans nos écoles. Il faut commencer par «Ô Canada» ou quelque sorte de truc comme ça. L'être humain en a besoin pour vivre, une maison, et pour s'habiller. À cette fin, je propose que ce comité adopte dans ses discussions avec d'autres provinces ou avec le Canada qu'il faut avoir une certaine assurance aux maisons. Je vais m'expliquer.

I want to explain myself here. When a firm goes bankrupt, governments go and bail them out. When individuals lose their jobs and go bankrupt, they lose their house. Why not have a national insurance scheme to bail them out, where they contribute to certain schemes to take these people out? Big companies, big industries, they get the money to bail them out. You should have a hard look to see that these people here, in the social work here, who work to contribute to the economy, and because the economy is bad they are losing their houses, they cannot afford it. A national scheme should be established so those people can save their houses because they have worked very hard.

Talking about the aboriginal people, we have to define in the Constitution—everybody tries to be the masters of the ceremony, they try to defend the aboriginal people, yet nothing has been done about it, although piecemeal. Either we have to accept them as Canadians or let them be aboriginals themselves. If we have to accept them as Canadians, we have to give them all the tools necessary for them to live their own life and put on their infrastructures thereby. If we do not do so, then let them be independent. However, we have to recognize that Canada is a signatory of the United Nations conventions. Taking them away from their habitat, destroying their livelihood, destroying their language and inheritance is called genocide and some governments have been practising that here. We have to take a hard look at that.

We have to look also at the question of education factors, that there has been some discrimination in the education business. Only Catholics and Protestants are being funded in this and other provinces across the country, whereas we have Jewish people, we have Indians, we have Italians—why are they not being funded? Why are only Catholics and Protestants being funded by the taxpayers? The Jewish have a right to be funded by the schools. They have schools. We have to take a hard look at that also. This has to be discussed.

Coming to the questions of abortion and capital punishment, politicians have not been able to enact laws either for or against abortions, either for or against capital punishment. I am suggesting here that during your meeting with other provinces, preparation should be made forward that there should be a referendum every eight years. Because

they are delicate matters, people should vote on these matters, either for or against abortion, or for or against capital punishment.

Those are the main points that I want to bring forward to the committee.

Mr Villeneuve: Thank you, sir, for your presentation at short notice. You are aware of course that the Constitution was repatriated in 1982; Quebec was left out. You are happy with that, quite obviously.

Mr Nair: No. Quebec was not left out. They opted to be out.

Mr Villeneuve: And you are happy with that.

Mr Nair: I am not happy with that one because of the “notwithstanding” clause because it gives some tools. It does not make any difference for them. They are using the same tools, the “notwithstanding” clause. Happy about that or not happy, it does not make any difference now. Beyond Confederation, they are enjoying the same status. As a matter of fact, they are better off than any other provinces.

Mr Villeneuve: I am just wanting to know. You are happy with that, quite obviously. You did not tell us whether you supported Meech Lake or not. Did you?

Mr Nair: No. I did not support Meech Lake, no, and I will not support Meech Lake because Meech Lake gave them certain—it was not well-defined. The notion of distinct society to me was for them to be distinct and other races to be extinct. I did not like the word “distinct.” When you want to protect your own culture, it does not mean that you have to destroy all the cultures to be protected. That is what I did not like with it. We are seeing now what was distinct with them. They were distinct; they have now only spelled it out with the 27 jurisdictions they want.

Mr Villeneuve: You realize that the amending formula also went with Meech Lake and therefore we are back probably worse off than we have ever been vis-à-vis the 1982 situation.

Mr Nair: I would not think so, because I think Quebec is better off now than it was before.

Mr Bisson: For the record, what is the gentleman's name?

The Chair: Chris Nair. Thank you, Mr Nair.

I call Eric Fawcett and John Valleau from Science for Peace.

Mr E. Fawcett: We would prefer to speak on the 28th.

ONTARIO RACE COUNCIL

The Chair: Hasanat Ahmad Syed from the Ontario Race Council.

Mr Syed: Thank you, Chairman and the members of the committee, for giving me this opportunity to appear before the select committee. My presentation is very small and brief but it represents, in a way, the feelings of people who have come to Canada and who have chosen Canada as their homeland.

From the very beginning, I feel obliged to make it clear that what we are discussing today is Canada, which is not the sum total of 10 provinces and the territories. It is much

more than that. Canada is a country representing hopes, aspirations and dreams of over 26 million people. They believe, and rightly so, that it is a caring and compassionate society and a country where tolerance, understanding and a spirit of accommodation of each other's points of view are the hallmark of a unique society, and it is for this reason that the people around the world look at us with envy and praise.

1710

Not long ago, an international personality, the supreme head of the Ahmadiyya movement in Islam, His Holiness Hazrat Mirza Tahir Ahmad spoke very highly of Canada, right in Toronto on 16 June 1989 at a dinner attended by 1,500 guests, including Bob Rae. His Holiness spoke of Canadian kindness, of Canadian generosity, of Canadian sense of humanity, of Canadian warmth, of Canadian hospitality and above all of Canadian humility, and he concluded his speech with a prayer that, "Let Canada become all the world, and the whole world become Canada." This is how Canada is seen and perceived.

What has happened to this high-profile country now? I believe there is nothing wrong with the Canadians. Each one of us has a throbbing and a feeling heart, and all of us love Canada and all of us wish to build Canada into a fine and ideal country.

So why are we here? Why are people in Quebec and all across the country engaged in soul-searching? It is because the very soul of Canada is at stake. I know each one of us is honest, sincere and dedicated to the cause of making Canada a lighthouse for the whole world. This we can do only if we cease to think in terms of Ontarians, Albertans or from Quebec.

Perhaps Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was right when he said, "Canada is not up for grabs," and we share his concern. Bob Rae pinpointed the reason rightly when he said, "Economic policies are standing in the way," and Jean Chrétien said it aptly, "The promise of a reborn Canada is overdue."

To my mind there is no constitutional crisis. It only exists in the minds of those politicians who wish to improve their ratings in the polls. What we need today is statesmanship, a vision and a dream of a greater and brighter Canada, in the same way as our founding fathers some 100 years ago conceived of a Confederation. Let us act today courageously so that Canadians of the 21st century think about us and say, "That was the finest hour of Canada, when Canadians joined their mind and soul to carve out a great and a vigorous country."

In this task, the people of Ontario have a very major role to play. Ontarians always feel and perceive as Canadians first. We have to mother this country. Speaking of mother, I recall a story of the days of King Solomon, when two women came fighting to him, each wailing and crying that the baby in dispute was hers. The wailing and the weeping was so convincing that the king for a moment felt lost. Then he had a brainwave and called his guard asking him to slice the baby in two and give half to each one of them. The real mother could not bear the tearing of her baby and implored that the baby may be given to the other woman, and so King Solomon found out the truth. So if Quebec

wishes to slice Canada, let it be so and let us see who loves and adores Canada more.

Turning to the economic aspect of the issue, when Bob Rae says, "What the federal government is doing to the economy is not really helping the overall effort to go through as a country," he is right. Even good marriages fall apart in hard times. Perhaps John Crow may be right in his fight on inflation, but as an economist he is incapable of understanding that his policies are hurting the very soul and body of Canada. Recession is a bad time, when people become edgy and angry. It is no wonder that we have become less tolerant, less generous and less accommodating.

Without commenting on the merits of free trade, I believe it laid down the real foundation of the disintegration of Canada. The free trade threw open the borders between Canada and USA while tough interprovincial barriers still exist. It is easy for a truck from Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia to roll through the border to the south, but it is very difficult for the truck from Quebec to cross through Ontario, and Alberta on its way to British Columbia. Why for goodness' sake will a person from Quebec look to Manitoba, Alberta or westward when he finds it easier to go to the USA? We must bring down the interprovincial barriers to build a strong Canada.

What holds Canada together is love and understanding of each other. If that is gone, Canada is gone. This is what we need most today.

People in Ontario will have to play a vital and important role. Like a mother, we have to think, what is good for Quebec, what is good for the people of Nova Scotia and what is good for the people of Manitoba and Alberta? When David Peterson, at the famous Meech Lake drama, offered six Senate seats to solve the crisis, the people of Ontario felt good and elated. The people of Ontario will have to go an extra mile instead of asking for their own pound of flesh. They will have to respond to the hopes and aspirations of smaller units.

The tragedy is that none of the politicians in Quebec has a vision and a dream of Canada. What Robert Bourassa and Jacques Parizeau are more concerned with are their own personal ratings in the polls by floating *Al-laire* reports or *Bélanger-Campeau* commissions.

Frankly, we the ethnic groups in Canada watch in great dismay the fight between the two founding cultures, both rich, and both have given a lot to Canada. I believe if Quebec wants to have more say in immigration, justice, fisheries, post office and telecommunications, let them have it. Canada is priceless. Canada is a lighthouse and it cannot be weighed in the scale of dollars and cents.

Who lives if Canada dies? Canada is a symbol of those moral values which are often absent in countries which have achieved unmatched progress in technology and war machine. When we sing our national anthem and say, "Canada, we stand on guard, we stand on guard for thee," do we?

I close this small presentation with the prayer of His Holiness, "Let Canada become all the world, and the whole world become Canada."

MARTIN AMBER

The Chair: Mr Amber, come forward.

Mr Amber: Without trying to hurt anyone's feelings or appearing negative, Mr Chairman, I would like to say that I have strong feelings of worry when I see people advise me what I should do who sit there and smoke one cigarette after the other, having no use at all for their own body but telling me what I should do with mine.

At the same time, I also have feelings that people do not really know what they have in their minds if they have to come before these committees with a prepared script and read religiously from them as though to say they have no spontaneity and no ability to be able to form their ideas as they go along.

Now I am going to say unequivocally that I do not like the way that some of the people that are sitting in positions of responsibility in the province of Ontario Legislature got there. Some of those people who I speak of know who they are, know the means that they used to get here and know that you could use the word that they cheated to get here, over people whose hard work in their communities contributed to actual things being done, which they took credit for, which they use with smiles behind their backs, under their sleeves and different parts of administrative positions that they got in other offices, and were able to use that as a springboard to gain entrance to these hallowed halls.

I call this the temple of talk because I have seen rhetoric expressed by a great many people who have sat in the Legislature, as they have in the House of Commons and other places for years, without ever really contributing anything tangible and anything constructive and anything helpful to people.

1720

As a matter of fact I have seen a trend where people are more interested in hurting people and different groups of people, particularly their political opponents, than helping people, then to wash that away and say, "Well, I am in a position of power." It reminds me of the movie with Robert Redford where a candidate was put in because the gap needed to be filled and because he was good-looking, was able to baloney things quite a bit, you know, on TV and everything, be in the position only to say at the end of the movie, "What do I do now?"

There seems to be a parallel of sorts, all by respect to my friend Mr Rae and to other people like Gerald Caplan who could not believe, a week after it happened, that it had happened, saying the same thing and you could almost see that same thing being said.

We are at a crossroads where a part of Canada and Canada's history is making noises as though it wishes to opt out of what might have been called the Confederation of Canada.

By the way, I have rewritten the words to the song "O Canada" or the song "The Maple Leaf Forever" so as not to offend anyone, and so as to be a song I think would be better sung as the national anthem than that horrible thing we have. The reason I would not give those words in public is, knowing the way the world is today, within three

seconds after I had made them public some enterprising thief would steal them. So I am not going to put those until I have secured, for my own sake, those words that will be, unfortunately like so many things that I have passed over to other people who made the money and everything else from it—maybe this time I might retain some small segment of history for myself in there.

But when it comes to the secession of the province and the people of the province of Quebec from Canada, I do not think in their best day right now—I can say this with the thoughts that I have, despite their new Premier, the opposition, the fact that Mr Bourassa is probably deathly sick—it was put to a test one other time when it seemed to be that it was inevitable, that the people of that province, realizing the parameters and the ramifications, have a real desire to separate from the rest of Canada.

Now you can have committees set up here that will listen to a lot of people and you could hear everything from a new voting system, which I would certainly support, to having a different kind of administration to the provinces and to Canada.

I was hoping that Mrs O'Neill would ask the question of more than one deputant: "How are these people going to be selected for office? How are they going to be put in?" That is the question. The only system we have that is democratic is to hold elections, but the elections are phoney and the elections are fixed and the elections are brought about by a gang of organized people who have learned how to get elected by this means. Then that system is something that has had its time and should go. That is one of the first things, to have a more democratic way, all things being equal, of having the proper representation of all the people of Canada and all the people of the province and down on the municipal level to end the cheating that has existed there for at least 20 years, on a higher ratio of the scale each year; it is to eliminate that.

There is the crux of the problem, where people show a discontent because they are being treated unfairly. That comes up almost every time something comes up where the élite, who have been mentioned here, are given their privilege over other people who are underestimated. I have seen talent, I have seen ability, I have seen people with creative capabilities almost beyond description, originating in Canada, go as fast as they could out of this country so that their talents could be used and exploited elsewhere, because of the cavalier treatment they get from the wise heads of the political élite of succession to positions of power in Canada in the different offices.

It is a question of patronage and not a question of quality, and that in itself is one of the downfalls of Canada where it should be, and I think deep down inside it is, but it should be one of the greatest countries in the world. Somehow, because of the actions of people who should know better, it falls down sometimes to what I used to say was below the level of the banana republics.

I could illustrate the reasons for that, but I will not because it is total negativity and I think our topic is how we find ways to encourage our friends, our neighbouring province, to feel wanted and to feel that we are all one instead of the way they have been made to feel by manipulation of

people whose position it is to exploit a situation for monetary gain and for political gain and just to make themselves feel big by doing it. That is, believe me, something that should never be allowed to exist for one minute.

I do not think that Quebec, the people of Quebec, really want to break away. I feel that maybe our aboriginal peoples were possibly overacting slightly in some of the things that were done because of the language of the Meech Lake accord, something that would make anybody angry when you try to portray a group of people as wanting something that the rest of the nation might not have. I think that was not brought out, as has been exhibited here, was not brought out truthfully but was brought out in a way as to ignite the incendiary flames that already existed in a touchy situation, so as to make it almost impossible for the transition of the united Canada at that time to come about.

Now whether it is too late or not, I am not going to attempt to say. I can say that it is up to the mentality and the capability of the people charged with the responsibility of portraying the situation as it really exists, rather than trying to go through a grotesque form of fiction and inventiveness of situations which may not and may never have really existed whatsoever.

I say that no more than you get people like Hussein to deter him from a path, you could not do that to people who have made up their mind. I suggest to you that is a very small minority of people who really want that. I think deep down underneath, most of the people in our neighbouring province do not want that, never did really want that and never will really want that even though they are being influenced by other people.

I would take some of the submissions that are going to be made here in the province of Ontario at face value and suggest to each one of you, charged with the responsibility of hearing them, to search down inside yourself and say to each one of you inside yourself: "What do I want? What do I want?"

I would even suggest that each one of you stand and report and tell, as a committee member charged with this important and most important of issues, how you feel about it, what your suggestions would be, as we are paying you for, and what you think should be done. That is everyone around this table and not a plebiscite in this fashion. People will come and you will glean from them ideas which you ultimately will use, from my experience, as your own. But you first show us your ability, your inventiveness, your ingenuity to put forth what you feel would be solutions. Then the rest of us, being your humble servants who elected you, will follow suit in that fashion.

If you have the capability to come forward with anything that does have the capabilities of bringing that about, I would be interested as your peer to hear it, rather than the other way around, inviting us to give you our suggestions, going forth—most of us are not on grants and never were in our life—unpaid, while you glean from that what you should do and then take maybe the best of it and put that forth as what you got.

If there is a committee struck to oversee this very important and most important crossroads in Canada's history, of the crossroads of one of our brothers or sisters succeeding, then you get your collective brains together and come up with a solution to us and publish it. I would suggest you do that before this committee goes from the province of Ontario elsewhere.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Amber. I think I can just say on behalf of the committee that certainly we recognize that our role, at the end of the process, is to come up with recommendations. I think we have been clear, however, and that has been part of our mandate, in wanting to hear from as wide a cross-section of people in the province as possible before we come up with recommendations about what we think the Legislature and the government should do. I think that is still the course we are set upon.

Mr Amber: I understand that fully but what I am saying, Mr Chairman, is to put the people who are supposed to have the ability to come up with solutions, who are paid for that, who certainly budget a good deal of money towards that, for them to do it. That is what a committee does.

The Chair: I understand your point.

Mr Amber: Yes, but that is not what you said. You said at the end of it. I say to you for you to stand and report and each day have a submission in the media from everybody that is on this committee. Let's see, without using their helpers and their—I do not know how many assistants they have and how many writers they have—for each person to honestly put forward their collective suggestions as to prevent it and see if there are genuine people here who have the genuine ability to come up with genuine solutions on their own to merit being in the position of office that they have in my province of Ontario and in my Canada.

The Chair: Thank you, sir. That concludes the speakers for the afternoon session. We will recess at this point and come back at 7 o'clock.

The committee recessed at 1735.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1910.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. This is the evening session of hearings in Toronto of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, for those people who may be following our proceedings over the parliamentary channel. We have heard a number of speakers this afternoon and this morning, and, of course, are proceeding with the list this evening of organizations and individuals.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

The Chair: Before we get to the speakers, I indicated to the committee members earlier that we had a meeting of the subcommittee over the lunch break to deal with a couple of issues, particularly the list of speakers that we have for our next day in Toronto, which is on the 28th, the last day of the hearings. Members of the committee will recall that we had asked people to hold 1 March as a possible time, and we are going to recommend as a subcommittee that in fact we now use that. I will read out the report of the business subcommittee and at the end of that ask Mr Bisson if he would move adoption of that.

The business subcommittee met at 1:30 pm today to discuss the committee's schedule. It is being recommended that the committee meet on Friday 1 March from 9:30 to 12 noon and from 1:30 to 5 pm. It was agreed that the meetings on Thursday 28 February would be at Queen's Park from 9:30 am to 12 noon, 1:30 pm to 5 pm and 7 pm to 10 pm. In the evening the committee will divide—or we are recommending it would divide—into two sections in a town hall format to hear as many people as possible, and the committee would divide into two sections at the Friday meetings, if required. This, again, is our recommendation as a way to deal with the large numbers of people who are on the list to speak to us here in Toronto.

The subcommittee agreed that it will review a list of organizations requesting to appear in Toronto and will decide on the agenda. We are doing that tomorrow morning before we begin our hearings in Windsor. Then, for the meetings in Ottawa, the subcommittee again will be reviewing the list of speakers who have been submitted to date and making some recommendations or some decisions around the scheduling of those as well. We expect to do that tomorrow, because we again have a large number of speakers. We think that problem is easy to cope with in the time we have in Ottawa, but here in Toronto it is quite clear that we will need that additional day in order to even get close to dealing with the large numbers of people who have expressed an interest in talking to us.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Mr Chairman, would you repeat that very first part of the announcement?

The Chair: That we would meet on Friday 1 March. In addition to the times we have, we would add Friday 1 March from 9:30 to noon and from 1:30 to 5 pm.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Is that going to pre-empt that commitment we made with the multicultural council?

The Chair: No, that is scheduled for the morning of this coming Friday. I hope to have more details about that tomorrow morning.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Are you giving people in Toronto the impression that this will be the only opportunity? I think when we first began this we said there would be other opportunities for Toronto people or large organizations to speak to us, in that it is much easier when we are sitting to hear these people.

The Chair: The two days we will have back in Toronto would be 28 February and 1 March, if the committee agrees to our recommendation to add that day, so there would be those two additional days, and we already have a number of organizations and individuals who are on the list to speak to us, if we choose to go that route.

Mr Bisson: I would like to move the adoption of the minutes with regard to the meetings on 1 March.

The Chair: Any further discussion?

All those in favour? Opposed? Carried.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE
DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: We will resume with the list of speakers and call on Serge Jacob from ACFO. Bonsoir.

M. Jacob : Bonsoir. D'abord, dans un premier temps, j'aimerais remercier le comité de bien avoir voulu entendre le mémoire de l'ACFO de la communauté urbaine de Toronto. En même temps, si je parle trop vite pour les traducteurs il faudra me prévenir, parce que je sais comment ce travail est difficile.

Alors, l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario/communauté urbaine de Toronto, aussi connue sous le nom d'ACFO-Toronto, existe depuis 1969. Nous travaillons à l'épanouissement des francophones de notre région en favorisant leur présence dans toutes les sphères d'activités. Bien entendu, nous le faisons dans un esprit ouvert tout en respectant le pluralisme ethnique et culturel de la communauté franco-torontoise.

Le Canada, il va sans dire, est à une étape délicate de son avenir. L'échec du Lac Meech, les disparités régionales et sociales, la crise autochtone, l'aliénation de l'Ouest, le mouvement souverainiste au Québec, tout cela remet en question l'existence même du Canada.

M. Rae a indiqué récemment qu'il s'attend à ce que l'Ontario redéfinisse sa place au sein de la Confédération. L'Ontario ne jouera peut-être plus son rôle traditionnel de chevalier servant de ladite Confédération.

Pour les francophones de l'Ontario, l'avenir qui se dessine à l'horizon doit comprendre certains paramètres. La constitution se doit de reconnaître les trois communautés nationales qui ont bâti le Canada, soit les communautés autochtones, francophone et anglophone. C'est la pierre angulaire d'une meilleure compréhension entre tous les Canadiennes et les Canadiens. On devrait réécrire les livres d'histoire pour refléter cette synergie ; nous sommes certains que cela serait source de tolérance.

Dans la même démarche s'inscrit le besoin de faire la promotion du rôle prépondérant que la communauté francophone a joué dans la découverte et le développement de l'Ontario depuis plus de 300 ans.

Maintenant, tournons notre attention vers les droits linguistiques. Nous préconisons le maintien du bilinguisme au sein des institutions fédérales. De même, les politiques linguistiques doivent tenir compte des droits, des intérêts et des besoins de la communauté autochtone.

Pour ce qui est de l'Ontario, il est essentiel que l'on déclare le français langue officielle et qu'on tienne compte des droits, des intérêts et des besoins de la même communauté autochtone.

Dans la même veine, parlons du droit à l'éducation. Les membres des trois communautés nationales ont droit à une éducation dans leur langue maternelle respective et cela dès l'âge de trois ans et jusqu'au postsecondaire. Ce droit doit être respecté dans les domaines suivants : services de garde, l'alphabétisation et la formation professionnelle. Les institutions résultant de ce droit sont gérées par chacune des trois communautés nationales.

Il est évidemment nécessaire que les textes de loi afférents à ce droit à l'éducation soient clairs et précis afin d'éviter d'être obligés d'avoir recours aux tribunaux pour faire respecter ce droit.

Passons maintenant à l'égalité des chances et le devoir des gouvernements de la promouvoir. La constitution canadienne doit reconnaître l'égalité des chances des trois communautés nationales. Elles doivent recevoir des services publics essentiels dans leur langue maternelle. Pour la communauté francophone, cela se traduirait en une gamme de services dans les secteurs scolaire, juridique, socioéconomique, de la santé puis aussi les services municipaux, sans oublier bien sûr le culturel et les communications.

Ceci doit être assorti de dispositions constitutionnelles qui engagent les gouvernements fédéral et provincial à faire la promotion de cette égalité grâce à des politiques et des programmes appropriés.

1920

Maintenant je vais vous parler de l'accès aux pouvoirs. Les communautés nationales doivent pouvoir gérer les structures politiques et administratives des services pertinents à leur épanouissement. Des mécanismes, des ententes et du financement doivent sous-tendre cet accès aux pouvoirs. Il est nécessaire que le statut d'égal de la communauté francophone se reflète dans l'organisation des pouvoirs et ce tant au palier fédéral, provincial que municipal. De plus, l'administration publique de la province de l'Ontario doit inclure davantage ces régions dans l'élaboration de ses politiques sociales, économiques et culturelles.

J'aimerais maintenant pouvoir passer au deuxième volet de notre présentation.

L'ACFO de la communauté urbaine de Toronto croit fermement que l'épanouissement de la société ontarienne est tributaire de son bien-être économique. Si l'Ontario est prospère nous pourrions, par l'entremise de politiques à caractère économique, atteindre un plus haut niveau de compréhension, de cohabitation, d'intégration raciale et de tolérance.

Nous nous devons d'élaborer des stratégies qui s'occuperont des vrais dossiers de notre société : la pauvreté des enfants, le sort des femmes chefs de famille, la violence conjugale, l'ignorance, la faillite de notre formation professionnelle, l'environnement, la vulnérabilité de nos villes monoindustrielles.

J'aimerais vous raconter une anecdote. J'ai des amis à Elliott Lake, et ces amis m'ont dit qu'ils pensent que le prochain Sault-Sainte-Marie sera Elliott Lake parce qu'on a fait 2000 mises à pied en septembre et que «rétrécissement économique» veut dire «baisse de la tolérance». Il y a aussi l'analphabétisme, une stratégie nationale en matière d'éducation, la récession etc. Comme vous devez le savoir tous, le sort des francophones serait fortement amélioré si nous parvenions à régler tous ces dossiers.

Mais le cadre dans lequel nous allons trouver des solutions à tout cela est remis en question. Quelle forme va prendre notre pays ? L'Ontario devra se poser des questions. Est-ce que ce sera un pays composé d'une province des Maritimes, d'une province de l'Ouest, de la Colombie britannique, des territoires et d'un Québec autonome ? Cette redéfinition peut-elle être faite avec comme argument la péréquation ? L'Ontario veut peut-être récupérer certains pouvoirs de dépenser, par exemple, ou certaines juridictions.

Que penser de l'existence de ministères semblables, un provincial et un fédéral ? Nous n'avons plus les moyens de nous payer toute cette infrastructure administrative.

Qu'advient-il des programmes sociaux qui sont chers à plus d'un d'entre nous, et d'un gouvernement central, par exemple, qui ne peut pas faire preuve de rigueur budgétaire ? Je n'ai pas besoin de vous parler des 400 milliards de déficit du fédéral — beaucoup de questions, je laisse les experts trouver des solutions. Un jour à Glendon, j'ai lancé une boutade à la fin d'une réunion — qu'on devrait enfermer tous les experts en constitution, les verrouiller, leur donner de l'eau et du pain. Ils y régleront les problèmes de la constitution et pendant ce temps-là on pourra s'attaquer aux vrais problèmes, les enjeux dont je vous ai parlé plus tôt.

D'autre part, nous pensons que les francophones en Ontario peuvent faire leur part dans la diversification des relations commerciales de l'Ontario. Si nous pouvions axer une partie de nos relations commerciales vers la Francophonie, avec un grand «F», nos marchés d'exportation seraient plus diversifiés et moins dépendants des États-Unis. Pour que les francophones de l'Ontario puissent faire leur part, ils ont besoin d'institutions, d'accès à l'éducation et à la formation, etc. Voilà, nous venons de boucler la boucle.

J'aimerais terminer avec ce qui d'après nous est le plus grand défi de l'Ontario, le développement d'une base commune de valeurs. L'Ontario ne semble pas avoir été capable de rallier sa société autour de valeurs communes à part l'ordre et la propreté.

Si depuis 1960 on avait mis de l'avant une base de valeurs qui aurait compris le rôle historique des francophones, leurs acquis grâce à la jurisprudence, à l'histoire, etc, on ne serait pas obligé d'expliquer que les francophones ne sont pas un groupe ethnique mais une des communautés nationales. On se souvient tous de

Sault-Sainte-Marie, de la mauvaise réception de la Loi 8 sur les services en français et surtout le problème de marketing que cette Loi a eu.

D'ailleurs, cette Loi doit recevoir à nouveau un engagement ferme de la part du Conseil des ministres pour donner un signal clair et précis à la population, mais aussi à la fonction publique ontarienne responsable de la prestation des services en français.

Mesdames, messieurs, je vous remercie de votre attention. Si vous avez des questions, il me fera plaisir de vous répondre.

M. le Président : Merci, Monsieur Jacob. Il y a quelques questions sans doute.

M. Bisson : Oui, une question très courte. Si je vous ai bien compris, vous dites dans votre mémoire que le gouvernement fédéral doit prendre le contrôle de certaines institutions, question de coûts. C'est ça que vous avez dit ? Je ne sais pas si j'ai bien compris si vous étiez en faveur de voir le gouvernement fédéral avec plus de pouvoir pour éviter la duplication des services provinciaux.

M. Jacob : Non, ce n'est pas l'intention du document. Tout simplement je passe l'observation qu'il existe tant au niveau provincial qu'au niveau fédéral des ministères qui sont, à notre sens, des duplications. On a un ministère de la Santé au fédéral, il y a un ministère de la Santé au provincial. Est-ce qu'on ne pourrait pas trouver des aménagements pour faire des économies, donc par conséquent dépenser l'argent où ça va faire le plus de bien ?

M. Bisson : Avez-vous des recommandations là-dessus ?

M. Jacob : Malheureusement, l'ACFO de la communauté urbaine de Toronto se voit très mal suggérer à des dirigeants et à des politiciens de prendre des décisions dans ce sens-là. Je pense qu'on peut remettre toutes les juridictions confondues tant au provincial qu'au fédéral dans le même blender et refaire une soupe où il va y avoir économie d'échelle, économie administrative. Je pense que c'est possible.

M. Villeneuve : Monsieur Jacob, vous avez mentionné, au sujet de l'enchâssement linguistique du français en Ontario vis-à-vis du projet de loi 8, que le projet de loi 8 avait été un pas, peut-être avec un manque de discussion, un manque d'explications. D'après vous, que voudrait dire l'enchâssement ou la déclaration de la province comme étant bilingue au-delà de ce que nous avons déjà avec la Loi 8 ?

M. Jacob : Écoutez, la Loi 8 est une loi héroïque, il n'y a pas de doute, et je pense que la communauté francophone en Ontario est très contente de cette Loi. Par contre, en Ontario on considère les francophones comme un groupe ethnique et c'est là le problème. Je pense que les livres d'histoire devraient être réécrits pour expliquer à la population qui vient de cent pays à travers le monde que, quand on vient en Ontario, il y a deux ou trois communautés nationales, qui sont les autochtones, les francophones et les anglophones.

Je pense que cela était un problème de société et je pense que, quand il y a des problèmes économiques, on dit : «Bon, mon frigidaire est vide mais on dépense de

l'argent pour des services en français. On devrait peut-être dépenser de l'argent pour la relance de l'emploi ou des meilleurs programmes ou des choses comme ça». Je pense que sur la place publique en Ontario on n'a jamais considéré les francophones dans leur rôle historique et dans la jurisprudence de la présence, disons, des Franco-Ontariens.

M. Villeneuve : Un comité comme nous avons ce soir ici, aurions-nous pu, dès le début du projet de loi 8, nous engager ou expliquer ? C'est un couteau à deux tranchants. Nous avons eu une réaction négative qui réellement m'a inquiété énormément. D'après vous, est-ce qu'une meilleure explication à ce moment-là aurait pu apaiser ?

M. Jacob : Écoutez, je ne suis pas là pour faire le procès des décisions du gouvernement Peterson de l'époque. Évidemment, le recul nous donne toujours, disons : «Si on avait fait autrement, ça aurait peut-être donné une meilleure situation». Je vous réponds en politicien, je vous l'accorde. Je veux simplement dire que oui, effectivement, si on avait peut-être mieux expliqué la Loi 8, ce que ça voulait dire et comment on avait pensé à des façons, des mécanismes pour assurer la livraison des services, peut-être que la réaction aurait été moins viscérale. C'est très irrationnel ce qui s'est passé par rapport à la Loi 8.

M. Villeneuve : Le gouvernement du jour a souvent mentionné qu'il aimerait avoir un Ontario bilingue. Si par hasard ça se produisait, avec encore le même couteau à deux tranchants, de la même façon, pourriez-vous nous expliquer d'après vous comment il faudrait prévenir ? Parce que dans le moment, la crise constitutionnelle qu'on a, a été créée un petit peu dans ce genre-là parce qu'au Québec on a des problèmes. J'ai une circonscription qui longe les frontières du Québec et puis je peux vous dire que ça crée des problèmes énormes.

M. Jacob : Oui, mais je pense que l'homme de la rue est content d'être Canadien, tant qu'il soit Québécois ou Albertain. Le problème est qu'après Lac Meech, on a titré dans les journaux : «Le Canada anglais a dit non au Québec», ce qui est faux à mon sens. Le Canada anglais n'a pas dit non au Québec. Il y a eu certains individus qui ont dit non au Québec et je pense que c'est ça le problème. Par exemple, c'est qu'on n'a jamais parlé de génocide culturel en Ontario, qu'on n'a jamais parlé sur la place publique pour dire qu'il y a eu pendant 60 ans des politiciens qui ont pris des dispositions pour assimiler les Franco-Ontariens. Ça, ce ne s'est pas passé.

1930

M. Villeneuve : On en a parlé cet après-midi.

M. Jacob : Bon, on en a parlé cet après-midi. Je n'étais pas là cet après-midi, donc je ne peux pas savoir. Mais on n'a jamais parlé sur la place publique en Ontario du fait qu'on avait systématiquement décidé dans une cuisine que bon, les Franco-Ontariens, on allait les assimiler parce qu'ils ne seraient pas capables d'aller à l'école, et puis effectivement ils allaient rentrer dans les rangs et puis ils allaient tous devenir des anglophones.

Malheureusement, ils ont oublié ce que c'était, les Acadiens ou les Canadiens français, comment on était coriaces. Donc, en 1986 le gouvernement Peterson a fait preuve d'un mea culpa historique, mais on a mal expliqué le mea

culpa historique. On ne s'est pas penché sur — comment expliquer — mais vous savez, le traitement des Franco-Ontariens, c'est comme les Arméniens, c'est comme les Kurdes en Iraq, etc. On a peur des mots, vous savez. On est une société où l'ordre et la propreté sont des valeurs que tout le monde a épousées. Est-ce que c'est bien, c'est pas bien ? Bon, on est en 1991, la situation politique va très mal et je pense qu'il faut commencer à avoir des discussions qui sont très franches.

M. Villeneuve : Monsieur Jacob, vous êtes un bon politicien.

Mr Offer: I have two short questions. In your presentation you have alluded on more than one occasion to the fact that the Constitution must recommend basically three groups: the francophones, the anglophones and native persons. Certainly we have heard that those three groups should be recognized, but we have also heard on a number of occasions that it should not just be limited to three groups, but rather it should also recognize the multicultural aspect of Canada. My question is if you can share with us your opinion on that one particular aspect.

My second question deals with the whole question of Franco-Ontarian rights. In the event that Quebec separated, or something less than but not the status quo, could you share with us what you see as the impact on Franco-Ontarian rights in this province as a result of that type of movement?

Mr Jacob: The school is called Jeanne-Lajoie. There are 50 nationalities in the school. I think multiculturalism in the Franco-Toronto society is a fact. We have within our own ACFO somebody from Zaïre, someone from la côte d'Ivoire. We have people from France, people from Quebec. We have a mixture of people. Multiculturalism is obviously something that is very apparent in Toronto, and I think why it has worked until now is because Toronto is a rich town and therefore there is money, so therefore there is tolerance and therefore people can cohabitate with one another.

Franco-Ontarians in the Ottawa region and in Toronto have been working with multicultural groups for a very long time. There are many organizations, whether it is les Français à l'étranger, or le Magreb, or le Cercle des Égyptiens-Canadiens or a series of groups, for example, which use le Conseil des organismes francophones du Toronto Métropolitain and things like that. That is why I talk about francophones. In the school elections next fall, for example, we hope some people who have French as one of their official languages identify themselves as francophones, because they feel closer to the French culture than to the English culture, whether because they grew up in North Africa or in Africa or in Vietnam, just to name a few, or they could be Cajuns or Acadians or whatever.

French multiculturalism is something that exists and is here to stay, and we are more than happy to work on ethnocultural relations. There is this Friday a meeting about racial integration, ethnocultural relations. We are working très fort at trying to find the solution of cohabitation and integration and things like that. What is interesting for Toronto is that the community is so much smaller that you will go to different things, whether it is a literacy group or a party or a dance or a concert or whatever, and will en-

counter people from many countries. I think that kind of integration is happening and is part of our daily life.

On your second question, for a very long time Quebec said to Ontario, "We can't say anything about how you treat your minority because minority treatment is a provincial jurisdiction." I am not either a history expert or a constitutional expert, but if treatment of minorities is a provincial jurisdiction, if Quebec left Canada there would still be a half million to 1 million, depending which sources you consult, who have French as an official language in Ontario.

People who have grown up, whose families have been in Timmins or in Elliot Lake or Cochrane for 120 years—Ontario is their home. It is not like they are going to pack up their bags and cross the river and go home or something like that. That would be such an aberration, to think that because Quebec left Canada, when—Le Devoir just published un sondage—Quebeckers in their heart are still willing to consider giving another chance to Canada.

It is an interesting phenomenon. I would think that Franco-Ontarians are here to stay. They have been here for 350 years. Jean-Baptiste Rousseau is the first citizen of Toronto. He was there when Lord Simcoe arrived on the boat, which has been more or less occulté from history books. There is a Jean-Baptiste Rousseau project in Toronto which la Société d'histoire de Toronto is working on which is an amalgamation of all sorts of history projects; also, English historical societies are working on the Jean-Baptiste Rousseau project.

We are here to stay, and therefore Ontario will still have to reckon with its minority treatment and with a historical legacy. Some of that historical legacy is not very savory—60 years of an attempt to assimilate Franco-Ontarians. Since 1968 Ontario has done l'étapisme, step by step, and I think it has proven there is a vitality in the Franco-Ontarian population. There was a report published on small business enterprises, which is very much the favourite of Franco-Ontarians. In Ontario you just have to look at the economic vitality of Hearst, which opened a community radio, found solutions to diversify its mineral-industrial bases, etc. I do not think that if Quebec chooses to exit Canada Franco-Ontarians would leave.

Second, you have to remember that in front of the Bélanger-Campeau commission, Jean Tanguay, who is the general president of l'ACFO provinciale, which is the umbrella organization that regroups 43 organizations in Ontario, said: "Whatever Quebec chooses, we are here to tell Quebeckers that we will be partners. We know the way of English-speaking Ontarians or of Ontario society and we can help you as diplomats or intermédiaires or whatever you want to call them." Does that answer your question?

M. le Président : Merci, M. Jacob.

1940

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF FILIPINO CANADIAN ASSOCIATIONS

The Chair: I call Mel Catre, from the National Congress of Filipino Canadian Associations.

Mr Catre: Good evening. My name is Mel Catre, representing the National Congress of Filipino Canadian Associations. Permit me to give you a short background of

our association. The NCFCA is an umbrella organization composed of over 30 associations, most of which are based in Ontario. It was incorporated as a non-profit association in 1981. Since then, our association has been involved in an advocacy role as an action group. The latest participation of our association was on the issue of access to professions and trades in Ontario. May I quickly mention that the community is awaiting action on that report submitted by chairman Peter Cumming last year. Nothing has been done so far; we hope to see some concrete action soon.

We deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before you tonight. Most important, when we are at the crossroads of planning the future of Canada, this gesture reassures the belief of the multicultural communities that we are indeed part of the new fabric of Canada. We are new Canadians in a new Ontario, participating in a new beginning. History tells us that in 1967, immigrant landings in Ontario were from England, Italy, USA, Scotland and Germany. Twenty years later, in 1987, immigrants were coming from Hong Kong, Guyana, Portugal, India and Jamaica, in that order. Yes, a different but a stronger Ontario.

Against this background is our long history of Confederation since 1867. The recognition of the multicultural society in Canada came only recently. In 1982, we were excited to see this recognition expressed in section 27 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms that provides, "This Charter shall be interpreted in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of the multicultural heritage of Canada."

This was followed by the enactment of the Canadian Multiculturalism Act of 1988. But what happened after is not a pretty picture. Funding for agencies along this line was cut to almost extinction. The provinces, which were supposed to support this enactment, did almost nothing to supplement this venture. Ontario is not an exception. Out of more than 1.8 million immigrants to Canada from 1966 to 1986, over 50% settled in Ontario. Yet today Ontario does not have a ministry of multiculturalism, there is no act specifically creating this particular ministry. The Ontario government declared a policy in 1987 that states, "The government will actively seek out the ideas, visions and concerns of individuals and cultural communities." This is a good start. We understand there is a staff working on multiculturalism under the Ministry of Citizenship. We suggest your committee look into this matter and try to put more action than words. We look at Ontario as a multicultural, multilingual and multiracial province. It needs a multiculturalism ministry.

The people of Ontario as well as the rest of Canada are now engaged in an issue: Canadian unity. Ontario should play a vital role. Concerns in the area of decentralization of some federal powers—environment, health, education, equal opportunities, economy and especially unemployment—always hit Ontarians the most. For example, the number of unemployed in Ontario has increased by 77,000 people since last September, according to Statistics Canada.

We are witness to the deep divisions and emotional debates on Quebec separation. We have seen the failure of

the Meech Lake accord, the Oka conflagration, the burning of flags, etc. We have seen our Prime Minister warning les québécois about the dream merchants, and the defensive posture of Parizeau passing the buck or the burden of proof to Canada to prove to them that Quebec's independence is bad for Canada and Quebec. Your committee, I am sure, must have heard numerous presentations on this subject. We hope the consensus is that Quebec should stay in Confederation.

There are more serious questions than answers in the air right now. Some of them are:

With whom will Quebec negotiate for independence? Legal luminaries are of the opinion that the federal government has neither the authority nor the mandate to negotiate. Can the provinces grant the federal government mandate to negotiate? Note that the current composition of the Parliament is composed of 25% from Quebec. In the event that sovereignty is unilaterally declared by Quebec, who will negotiate with Quebec? Would it be Parliament minus the Quebec MPs and senators? Are these legal?

Can Quebec survive economically, considering that 53% of Quebec's exports are to the rest of Canada? Will an independent nation of 6.7 million people survive in this era of globalization? Europe is on the move to federalism and the European economic council is gaining momentum. USA, Canada and Mexico are unifying free trade agreements, while Japan is unofficially controlling the Asian and Pacific Rim, and now Quebec wants to be on its own.

What are the territorial borders of Quebec? The aboriginal peoples' claims are still a big question.

How will you divide current Canadian assets and foreign debts? This and many more questions exist.

There are proponents who say, "Let Quebec go." Some quarters fear the loss of Quebec is not good for Ontario, while some believe otherwise. We happen to believe that Canada without Quebec is not the same Canada we know, and Quebec without Canada is not the same Quebec the world knows. It is inevitable that Ontario will deal and negotiate soon. We are confident that Ontario will never negotiate out of fear and will never fear to negotiate.

Ladies and gentlemen, when we came to Canada, our concept of Canada was one of a peaceful country, rich in cultural heritage, that the anglophones, francophones, aboriginal people and people from different countries of the world live in peace and harmony in this country. We are Canadians by choice.

On a personal note, I have been in Canada for almost 20 years. I would say these years I have spent here were beautiful and inspiring. It is like a dream, and the Canada of tomorrow a vision. For those Canadians who have not seen people dying of hunger, political persecution and tortures in the Third World, life in Canada would look different from their perspective. But for us, who came from these countries, Canada today is well lived, and therefore every yesterday a dream of happiness and every tomorrow a vision of hope.

On the subject of the French language, we believe that learning French is beneficial to all of us, and for the new Canadians who came to this country whose mother tongue

is neither English nor French, learning both languages is exciting.

Avec votre permission, j'aimerais essayer de parler en français pour démontrer notre désir d'apprendre cette langue officielle au Canada. En démontrant que nous respectons l'héritage historique du Canada basé sur l'anglais et le français, nous espérons que le Canada d'aujourd'hui respectera aussi notre héritage culturel et nos coutumes et pratiques religieuses. Le Canada d'aujourd'hui et de demain est fondamentalement différent du Canada que nous avons connu hier. Nous sommes Canadiens aussi. Notre constitution doit fournir cette garantie aux enfants de nos enfants.

Thank you very much. I would like to take some questions.

1950

Mr Offer: Thank you very much for your presentation. On page 3 you said that when you came to Canada, the concept of Canada was of a "peaceful country, rich in cultural heritage, that the anglophones, francophones, aboriginal people and people from different countries of the world live in peace and harmony in this country." I think in those four lines in your presentation you have summed up a great spirit, a feeling of what the country is to so many people, not only within but outside the country.

But as you know at this point in time there is a continuing discussion about Quebec's place in Canada, about the possibility of a different form of Confederation, if not potential, total separation. I am wondering if you might share with us—I know you have some great experience in this matter—how you see that type of activity impacting on the multicultural fabric of this province, whether it might detract from some of the things which we have held so dear to all of us.

Mr Catre: I would like to base my answer on the perspective from our association and I think most of the thinking of the association members. It is that the problem that we have today in Canada is a great problem because it is a problem of unity, and our concept will not change no matter what will happen. If Quebec leaves, for example, in either form, whether it is Confederation or sovereignty-association or an independent Quebec, the concept will not change. We will just be disappointed that Canadians would let Quebec go and not put up a fight to let them stay in the family, because as I said the powers of Canada—in the outside world it is so beautiful and it is so strong with Quebec, and without Quebec I do not know the concept. I would not venture as to the concept by which the other worlds and other people from other countries would see Canada by then.

Let me just backtrack to 1970 where we had this problem when martial law was declared here. I was not here yet. We read about it and it was not shocking at the time. We knew that martial law was declared in the country we came from, not at the same time; three years apart. But the powers declared at a time, based on separation, based on ideological conflict, were dangerous and did not portray a good image for Canada for people who are in different parts of the world.

It is our hope that we would struggle hard to keep Quebec in Confederation, maybe not in the same form, but in a form that everyone can live with.

Mr Bisson: You talk, as many other people have talked before this committee, yourself as an immigrant to this country, about the vision of how you saw this country before coming, as being a tolerant country. We heard people say again today before committee, and in past times as well, that one of the strengths they thought of this country was the image we portray as being a tolerant society.

We hear some people within our country talking about, "No, we have to be the same and we cannot be tolerant of other people, of the multicultural aspect of this country, the francophones," etc. What do you think can be done to try to get the people to understand what this issue is really all about in regard to what tolerance brings?

Mr Catre: Those are very good questions because as I said in my speech and deliberation, really the official recognition of a campaign from the government, officially recognizing the multicultural fabric of Canada and composition, not just francophones but people from other countries, only just came in in 1988 with the multiculturalism act. That is not really far from 1991 or 1990.

It is a good beginning. We do not have any argument with that. It is just a question that now we have a basis. We have a law that can be enriched. Before that, there was nothing at all, nothing in the BNA. The Charter of Rights was only enshrined in 1982. But from 1867 to 1982 is a long way. So during that lull of time, there was really nothing that officially would say we were going to work along this line with multicultural, multilingual people in Canada.

It is a good start from this time on to band together, probably reinforcing those enactments with other forms of support by way of campaign, by way of outreaching and networking with people, not just the immigrants but the francophones and the aboriginal people who are here in Canada. I think there should be networking and more funding to the agencies too, to send the message to the grass-roots level that we are indeed multicultural.

Mr Villeneuve: Thank you very much, sir, for your presentation. I come from a riding that is along the Ontario-Quebec border in southeastern Ontario. You have explained some of the real difficulties that would be inherent should ever—heaven forbid—the province of Quebec secede from Confederation.

You have chosen Canada as a place where you want to live and raise your family. You have explained many of the negatives here. Then you have come on and explained why maybe we should try to keep it together. Coming from the Philippines, as you do, I gather—and by the way, how many languages do you speak in that country?

Mr Catre: Two: English and Spanish.

Mr Villeneuve: English and Spanish. I have had occasion to go to Europe and a number of countries that have two, three and four languages.

Mr Catre: I guess Philippine is the third language—Tagalog.

Mr Villeneuve: You have explained some of the problems as you foresee them and attempted to cover some of the positives as you finished up your summation. You have not said whether these problems are insurmountable, and again I come from that area where French and English get along quite well together, where you cheer for the Canadiens or the Maple Leafs, and I know there are now a lot more than that. That has been healthy to this point.

All of sudden, for some reason, for some of the things that have happened in Quebec, again in reaction, along the Ontario-Quebec border—there are some irritations and they may look and sound major to some people. For example, you cannot go into Quebec to work in a job that is unionized. But I understand that is general throughout the province of Quebec and people do not understand that. They seem to think they are being discriminated against because they happen to be from Ontario. That is not quite the case, but it certainly seems that way and I cannot explain it.

How do you, as one who has chosen Canada, feel about the problems as you have outlined them? Can we surmount them and keep this country together?

Mr Catre: Very good question. I am a positive person and I think categorically I could say we can surmount them. The problems that I have illustrated in my presentation, as you observed, are really deep. A lot of people could not understand the rationale behind the behaviour of the people right now on both sides. It is because it has gone from a logical point of view to an emotional point of view.

Mr Villeneuve: Exactly.

Mr Catre: There is no logic in emotion. I think based on that, if we could just tone down the emotion and get into our rightful, logical thinking, we could climb mountains and we could solve the problems.

Mr Villeneuve: Roll up our sleeves and make it happen.

Mr Catre: I think we can.

2000

JOHN MELIN, ROBERT GREENHILL,
PATRICK PICHETTE AND MARTIN LEBLANC

The Chair: I call next a group of five people: Robert Greenhill, Patrick Pichette, Leah Taylor, Martin LeBlanc and John Melin. We need another chair, I think.

Mr Melin: That is fine. Leah Taylor will not be able to be with us this evening, so there are only four of us.

The Chair: All right. Just for the record, if you are each going to speak, perhaps you would identify yourselves as you go through, just so we know who is who.

Mr Melin: Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to let us speak here. We are a group of five friends who work together. We come from across the country. In fact only one of us is a native Ontarian. We all share a very strong belief in a functioning, unified Canada and we are also very concerned about the challenges facing Canada. I guess we feel confident in portraying ourselves as concerned Canadians.

I will just take a moment to introduce ourselves. Martin LeBlanc is an Acadian from New Brunswick. Robert

Greenhill is a western Canadian currently living in Toronto. Patrick Pichette is a Québécois from Montreal, and I am John Melin and I am from Saskatchewan.

As I said, we share a strong belief in Canada. We believe in a prosperous, multicultural Canada, a Canada within which individuals are given considerable freedom and support to develop and live fully. We believe in a Canada within which cultural groups are given the opportunity to preserve their cultural identities, and we believe in a Canada in which those individuals and those communities have social and economic rights, and social and economic obligations.

We got together and we talked and we debated and talked and debated. We talked through a muddle of issues which are bundled together in the debate over Canada's future, and there were really two groups of issues which jumped out. There were emotion-based issues and there were substantive issues, both of which we think are equally important.

Now first, I will speak very briefly about the emotion-based issues. There have been a lot of perceived insults in Canada. Quebec perceives an insult over Meech, francophones throughout Canada perceive an insult over the unfulfilled 1970s promise of bilingualism, and many English Canadians perceive insults, as well, over concerns and demands expressed by French-speaking Canadians or Quebec, and there have also been a lot of inflammatory reactions.

These emotions are important, but we have to understand, when emotions drive issues, to try and channel that emotion positively and not make statements or claims calculated to irritate. Also, the emotional issues are related to the substantive issues. We need to look at the principles to resolve the substantive issues. We feel we should not get entrenched in positions because of the emotional issues.

There are real substantive issues which must be resolved for Canada to continue as a robust, Canadian nation. To do this, we think Canadians must think in terms of really building mechanisms to support the Canada we believe in. In essence we need to get the process right. We need to reassert Canada's strength as a nation. Throughout our talk, there will be two messages that we will give you about the process.

We believe, first, that it is important to focus on the vision and then worry about the best institutions. Incremental bargaining is zero sum. We need to consider the determining factors of Canada: the Canadian peoples, the Canadian geography, the Canadian values, and then resolve a vision of Canada, and then finally design the institutions and structure to serve the vision.

The second message is very simple. It is an extension of the first. Structure is not the solution. The solution will likely fit with a number of different structures.

Our presentation has three parts. First, Martin will speak about why we believe Canada is strong, worth preserving, worth strengthening. Second, Robert will speak about what we consider the challenges to be, and finally, Patrick will speak about how we think Canada should meet these challenges in order to continue to be the country that

we as Canadians—and we believe most Canadians—respect and admire and would like to see continue.

M. LeBlanc : Distingués membres du comité, je m'appelle Martin LeBlanc. Je suis un Acadien originaire du Nouveau-Brunswick. Je vais vous adresser la parole d'abord dans ma langue maternelle qui est le français, pour ensuite terminer mes propos en anglais.

J'aimerais vous proposer, dans les quelques minutes qui me sont permises, les raisons pour lesquelles notre groupe croit en les richesses et les valeurs et l'énorme potentiel que possède le Canada tel qu'il a existé et tel qu'il devrait exister à l'avenir. Nous estimons que le Canada possède des richesses naturelles, culturelles et économiques qui font de ce pays l'envie de la plupart des pays du monde.

Les richesses naturelles : nous savons tous que ce vaste pays possède un potentiel énorme en matière de ressources naturelles. Nous sommes un peuple qui sait vivre en unisson avec la nature et la protéger et nous devrions en bénéficier. En tant que gardiens du Nord et de cette vaste nature, les Canadiens ont aussi devant eux un privilège, mais également une responsabilité et aussi un grand défi.

Les richesses culturelles : le Canada est multiculturel par définition, un pays où des peuples de partout au monde sont venus et continuent de venir pour réaliser leurs rêves. Nous sommes un pays où la volonté de maintenir des traditions culturelles est un fait marquant de notre société. Le multiculturalisme est un fait canadien et non un fait anticanadien. Nous bénéficions tous de ce riche mélange de cultures.

En matière de richesses économiques : le Canada possède un des niveaux de vie et de bien-être les plus élevés au monde, même parmi les pays de l'Occident. Nous possédons aussi une des mains-d'œuvre les mieux éduquées et formées au monde.

We also believe that the natural cultural and economic riches that I have just mentioned provide the basis for and have led to a set of shared beliefs and values that we all share as Canadians.

First, we can say that respect for the individual is a shared belief of Canadians. Each Canadian has the freedom to live and prosper in a liberal society. Each Canadian citizen also has social and economic rights. We believe that those rights are also counterbalanced by social and economic obligations, which leads us to a second set of shared beliefs, which is respect for others.

We believe in the basic belief of equality of opportunity, that Canada has strong social programs to ensure that every Canadian has a minimum standard of living and the ability to prosper. This is evidenced in our education and health programs. Embedded in this respect for others is the respect for cultural and linguistic minorities. Our pluralist society aims to provide equality of opportunity to all cultural minorities as well.

This respect for others is also seen in the political tolerance that is shared by all Canadians, or most Canadians. There is in Canada a strong basis for the respect of minorities. The fact that there is no clear cultural majority across all regions provides counterbalances which ensure that minorities can prosper. Finally, Canadians also share a view

of the role of government as a facilitating agent, not as an instrument of ethnic or regional oppression.

We see Canadians as sharing a respect for nature, as well as custodians of the greatest wilderness in the world, where our people live together with nature and with respect for the natural environment.

Our group feels that Canada's riches and the common belief that its people have, have led to a vibrant, strong country, which has the respect of the world community. For a country of 25 million inhabitants, we have achieved considerable stature in the international community. We are a part of the group of seven in industrial powers. We also are one of the dominant countries within the Commonwealth and a prominent figure within the United Nations.

To conclude our group feels strongly that Canada's riches, values and beliefs make this country unconstrained in its potential and it now seems a matter for Canada to invest in these riches and build on those strengths. Robert?

Mr Greenhill: I am Robert Greenhill. A country that is vibrant, a country that is growing is a living thing and like all living things, we believe, it goes through stages of change. These stages of change are necessary, are part of growing, but are not always easy and are often not pleasant. It is our belief that we are going through a stage of change right now and we are doing that in response to four challenges.

First, the fundamental challenge is that Canada today is very different in many ways from the Canada of 50 years ago. Second, there are a number of economic challenges facing Canada which we have not yet, as a people, overcome. Third, there is the challenge of addressing the growing sense of alienation, most strongly expressed in Quebec but felt elsewhere through this country. Fourth, there is the challenge of restoring a national sense of vision, lacking right now, at least partly due to a lack of national leadership.

Dealing first with the fact that Canada, we believe, is very different today than it was 50 years ago, first, culturally we are much more diverse. Fifty years ago a majority of the people were of British descent and a majority of the rest were French. Almost all shared European traditions and beliefs. Today that is not the case. We are more diverse. We have more cultures from many different parts of the world. Today there is a greater need for explicit steps to build a homogeneity of basic shared beliefs within this diversity of cultural backgrounds in a way that was not necessary 50 years ago.

Another way in which we are a very different country than we were 50 years ago is in the political balance of power. The regions are stronger and they are more autonomous, whether due to educational and social changes, such as the Quiet Revolution in Quebec, or due to political and economic changes, such as estate building under the Lougheed government in Alberta. The change in the political balance of power is one of these challenges within the changed Canada.

2010

In addition to these challenges of a changed Canada, we face, due in part to changes internationally, an economic

challenge. Our international competitiveness is in serious question. Due to duplicity and bureaucracy in everything from environmental regulations to drivers' licences, we have higher costs and low responsiveness in addressing international competitors.

At the same time, provincial trade barriers continue to close doors east-west when they are being opened north-south. Compounding the economic challenge is the fact that our basic economic structure is undergoing fundamental change. Commodities on which we depended for much of our richness for much of our time as a nation are continuing to decline in real terms. They have for many years and are likely to again in the future.

At the same time, the industrial base that we have developed, particularly in Ontario, is under siege, due in part to the industrialization of low-cost developing countries, due in part to the amazing competitiveness of countries such as Japan, due in part to the free trade agreement and as of yet our poor and unco-ordinated national response to it.

Compounding the challenges of our country being different and our economic challenges, we have the challenge of dealing with the increasing sense of alienation across this country, some inherited from past problems, some made greater by the social and economic changes of the last 10 or 20 years. We believe this is most strongly felt and most immediately in need of being addressed in Quebec, but also in the west there is a sense of being economically and politically marginalized, and the aboriginal people, resurging in their sense of self, are growing increasingly discontented with the status quo.

On top of those, and perhaps most important of the challenges facing us, is the challenge of a lack of vision. Our vision of ourselves as a country seems temporarily out of focus. We have a collective sense of what it is we are, but it is blurry. We believe the greatest reason for this may be in fact the failure in national leadership. Those who are supposed to be the vocalizers and magnifiers of our national vision are blinded by political incrementalism and zero-sum regional competition. Indeed, it is ironic that the last attempt at building a national vision was done by those who, by the nature of their jobs as representatives of provinces, are myopic in their view of a greater Canada.

I have talked about some of the challenges facing and testing us as a nation, but we also have, we believe, great opportunities. In our view, in the new peoples are new strengths, and in stronger regions there is a greater ability to care for our citizens from sea to sea. The economic and political challenges are here to prove or break us. If we succeed, we come out stronger. Just like when other living things go through stages of change, it is to grow.

Out of the crisis caused by the lack of vision and the absence of leaders may come new visions and new leaders, sensing and responding to and articulating a new and stronger Canada. These challenges are great, but so is this country and so are the strengths of its people. We can overcome these challenges; the only question is how, the question that Patrick will now, in part, try to address.

M. Pichette : Patrick Pichette, Montréalais d'origine. Je vais adresser le comité en anglais pour faciliter la discussion.

Now that we have heard about what we think is the situation and the issues concerning Canada, I am going to address what we think is the way to a resolution, or a potential resolution. What ensures the viability of a country or a national entity to us is the agreement among its members about its common beliefs. These beliefs can be either a set of current shared values or even aspirations of future goals that bind them.

We believe that a Canadian national identity can only survive if there exists a vision to support it. A national vision is critical. First, it clearly identifies the Canadian goals worth striving for. These are economic, social and cultural. Second, a vision provides the government with the focus and legitimacy to develop the necessary structures and institutions to promote the vision and to serve the people of Canada.

Defining a national vision is not an easy task. In order to do this we need to thoroughly understand the determining factors of the country, for example, the country's cultural heritage in terms of ethnicity, mythology, regional mix, climate, geography, etc, but most important in defining a vision we need leadership. Only through leadership can the vision take form.

The national leaders have a responsibility to build a vision and shape government structures and the institutions to serve it. They must work at strengthening these structures and institutions, and stay away from the rest. But structure, as my colleague just told you, is not the solution to the current problems and strains. The solution is in the design of the right institutions and structures to serve the vision.

For example, a structure that serves the vision of Canada is transfer payments. In the United States, they do not have transfer payments as we have them in Canada and you just have to go to Mississippi and compare it to New Jersey or Vermont and you will see what transfer payments do. On the other hand, there are structures that are constricting in Canada. Why do I need 10 driver's licences because I am in 10 different provinces? If I am a worker in Canada, I should be able to move freely around without any of these constraints.

The institutions that serve Canada, the CBC and Katimavik—Katimavik is now not a program any more, but it was a program in Canada. I served on Katimavik. I have travelled through the country as a youth and served in different communities and lived with 10 people from totally different parts of Canada and totally different backgrounds. These to us are institutions, not structures, that help Canadians understand what it is to be a Canadian, what it is to live in different parts of Canada; and the CBC, with its mandate of giving Canadians the news of Canada and the feeling that there is a place in New Brunswick that you can relate to when you listen to the news.

Structures that do not serve the vision well, we believe, are things such as interprovincial trade barriers. As Robert commented, if we have doors opening north-south, it would be illogical on a trade basis to have our high barriers in Canada as we have them today.

Also, structures that we think do not serve the mission are things such as language rights over immigration. We do believe this is something that is important, to respect

and reflect the regional communities. Therefore, if you are an immigrant coming to Alberta, you should have to respect and reflect the regional communities, and the same thing would apply to Quebec.

Now that I have talked about the structure and the vision, I would like to summarize the points in the following way. We believe that national identity resides in what the people work at and work towards. Because of this, a national vision is necessary. We believe the Canadian identity is something alive. It is strong and worth developing. We believe the federal government as an institution and its leader have a crucial role to play in redefining our national vision. The Trudeau vision of Canada, designed during the 1960s for the 1960s, is simply inadequate for the country and a country that is now tackling the challenges of the 1990s. The only way we can find a solution is to concentrate first on the Canadian determining factors and the Canadian vision, and only when this is done should we look at designing institutions to serve the vision.

It is through this process that we can ensure a Canada in which Canadians are able to prosper, preserve their cultural identities and yet share and contribute to a strong Canada. By doing this, I think Canada may in fact act as a leader and a role model in the international community.

John is going to pass around sort of a schematic approach to what we have been discussing. It will illustrate what we have talked about—determining factors, the idea of a mission and how the leadership is crucial to it and how all of these influence the structures and institutions.

I would like to thank the members of the committee. If you have any questions, just ask them.

The Chair: Thank you very much for your presentation. I think I speak on behalf of the committee in saying that we have had other group presentations before. We had a group of students talk to us at another location, but it is the first time that a group of people, as you have said, who work together have just come together and talked about some of these issues and have proceeded to put together a presentation like this. Thanks very much. We appreciate that.

There are a couple of questions. First, Mr Beer.

Mr Beer: Thank you for your presentation. One of the questions that has been brought before us is the sense of how much time we have to try to resolve a number of questions, including developing a vision that everybody could buy into. You are all from different parts of the country and I am sure, through family and friends, are in touch with what is happening there. What is your sense of the time we have here? I do not want to just put the onus on Quebec, but more broadly. How much time do you think we have, or is that a false problem and we should not be worried about that? It just seems to me that what you are putting forward would need some time to articulate the kind of vision that you think we need to have. I put that to anybody and everybody.

2020

Mr Pichette: I think I would like to answer this question in talking again about this idea of structure and vision. If you told Canadians tomorrow morning that we recognized

that structure is not the way to go at it, I think they would give you time—I think in most cases, if Quebec was told and if a lot of people were told. Okay? Obviously Meech did not work and we attacked it from a structural point of view and this is a perfect example where it illustrates the fact that it does not work.

Now, what we need to do is not rush into more structures, which are most of the attempts on Quebec in a lot of ways; to look at a structural way to solve its problems. As I say, let's sit back, because there is no reason to rush into this. Let's sit back and think about it and look at what the real issues are, what the real vision is. If in fact, once you have sat back and you have recognized that your vision is totally incompatible with the one of the rest of Canada, then you would have a point to say go ahead. But at least I think if you present it in this fashion, to my sense anyway, people would give you the time to think about it.

Mr Beer: It becomes very critical then for us to identify the values, for example, that we would see that we share as Canadians as part of that vision. That is one of the questions we have in our background paper. So you would really stress that aspect of it far more than the division of powers and those structural issues.

Mr Pichette: Yes, I think so. We can discuss it in a lot of detail, so basically we believe as a group that the economic rationales for having a united Canada, especially with the trade barriers as we know them today, are fairly weak. There are good reasons, for example, to be in the group of seven, the G-7. There are huge advantages being in as a country, but within Canada and within the North American context I think it is not enough to say, "We can survive independently," and all this. I think we have to go back and look in fact much more at what is the common denominator underlying all the Canadian identity and from there work bottom up.

Mr Greenhill: If I can build on Patrick's point, we may only have two years, we may only have four years. We will not know until after the fact whether we have succeeded or failed. But if you only had two years or only four years, better to spend that time determining whether or not you have a fundamental set of beliefs that you believe in across this country rather than debating who should have inland fisheries and who should have communications.

Our sense is that right now the debate being caught on divisions of power and structure has become a very zero-sum one. It appears that one group can only gain if another group loses, whereas if you work together to try to define and articulate a shared vision of Canada and then adjust your structure to reflect that, you have a much more positive type of environment, a much more positive atmosphere within which you are negotiating the changes in our institutions.

The other point too is if in fact you are put against the wall very quickly on structural changes, we actually think a much more decentralized Canada could succeed if the shared values are there, and institutional support outside of structures such as CBC, such as Katimavik, such as immersion programs, such as the different programs at the government level whereby students go across the country

during the summer or at the corporate level whereby the hotels in Alberta tend to hire people from Quebec and Ontario and vice versa. As long as those are there reflecting a shared vision, the structure can be much more decentralized and you can succeed.

On the other hand, you could have a structure that is much more centralized and it could fail if it does not reflect the shared vision; hence our sense that to a certain extent a lot of the debate has been focused on the wrong things, particularly given the short time we have.

Mr LeBlanc: If I could just continue on that, I think one way of buying perhaps a bit more time is to tone down the inflammatory rhetoric that we have seen and the antagonism between the various regions. I think that is where an Ontario or a government has a role to play in ensuring that when something like the Allaire report comes out or other things that are being tabled come out, we see this in an objective way and we keep our objectives focused on this thing and do not get caught up in inflammatory rhetoric.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I want to say thank you for taking the time, getting together and carrying on that long tradition of Canadian institution called debate and sitting down and discussing the direction this country or whatever issue should go. I just think I would like to touch on what you said; then I will come to the question.

One of the big problems we have now is that in the past there have never been time lines on issues such as this, and all of a sudden artificial time lines have been put on, for the past number of years, and God only knows where that comes from. I do not see that as being a Canadian tradition. Our tradition has always been open-endedness when it comes to discussing this because we have always been a country that is evolving and changing with the times.

You speak of vision and I think you are right. We do have to have some vision of where we want to go and try to work towards it. Can you share with us what your vision is, if you have one? What do you see as part of the obstruction from getting us there?

Mr Pichette: I would like to start. I cannot tell you all the things that are in my vision of Canada. I will speak as an individual now. But one of them that I certainly do feel is there are two critical aspects to Canada, to me. One of them is a sea-to-sea country, or ocean-to-ocean, I do not know—a *mari usque ad mare*. To me there is an openness to have a geographically sort of limitless type of country. I think that psychologically, in the Canadian psychology, it is incredibly important. There is a feeling of non-confinement and that builds a lot of room for diversity and it builds a lot of room for entrepreneurship. That is something I really cherish.

The second one is the equality of opportunity. Obviously Europe has tons of social programs as well. We are not the exception to the rule here. But I think, given our position with our economic structures and all that, we do promote economic equality in a way that is—I do not like that word—liberal.

Mr Bisson: It is still a good word.

Mr Pichette: That is right. It is that horrible word. I should not have used it.

Mr Bisson: It is a temporary setback.

Mr Pichette: That is right. But basically this idea that not everybody in Canada has to be equal in the sense that not everybody should make the same earnings, but everybody should have equal opportunity and there should be a minimum standard of living for every individual in Canada, these kind of programs and ideals are to myself—and I think too a lot of my colleagues will share this—I think they are vital and it is something that is brought by tolerance. It takes tolerance to be able to write a cheque down or you pay your income tax and you know that this guy down the road is going to get half your paycheque. That type of thing is truly Canadian and it is something worth fighting for.

The Chair: Or against, as the case may be.

Mr Melin: I would like to add I agree with Patrick fully on the social standards. To me, my vision of Canada is the social standards, the equality, the minimum standard of living. This is a society in which people do not suffer.

I come from Saskatchewan. I feel very strongly that Canada is a country which has a number of different cultures and people from all over. I am fully bilingual, and I am fully bilingual because I speak English and Swedish and I do my best in French. I am Swedish in background in part, and that is just part of the tradition in my family. I feel very strongly that my maintaining that is not anti-Canadian.

I am not sort of reducing my worth to the country. I feel that contributes. Growing up in Saskatchewan with friends who had Ukrainian backgrounds and backgrounds from all different countries, I felt it was very enriching. You know, we often make external comparisons. We say the difference between Canada and the United States is that in Canada we care. We can make the comparisons as well on a cultural basis with the United States or with Europe. In Canada we have people from different cultures and we live together and we get along, and that is very important to me.

2030

M. LeBlanc : Si je peux juste terminer avec une vision personnelle du Canada. Je suis très reconnaissant au Canada du passé, depuis les années 60, en tant qu'Acadien et notre nature multiculturelle. Si j'ai pu préserver ma langue et si je peux vous parler ce soir en français, c'est parce qu'on a eu des lois qui protégeaient les minorités.

Au Nouveau-Brunswick, nous sommes une province qui est fondamentalement bilingue, légalement bilingue. J'ai pu étudier en français toute ma vie. Jusqu'à l'âge de 22 ans, à travers mes études universitaires au Nouveau-Brunswick, j'ai pu reconnaître que si ce n'était pour ces lois-là et l'encouragement que nous avons eu d'un gouvernement fédéral qui protégeait les minorités, notre communauté acadienne, qui est très vivante dans le moment au Nouveau-Brunswick, ne serait plus ou serait des cadavres encore chauds, comme on a dit une fois.

Mais je ne crois vraiment pas que nous sommes des cadavres encore chauds et c'est en grande partie le résultat de cette vision du Canada qui protège les droits des minorités.

RENATO CIOLSI

The Chair: Could I call next Renato Ciolis.

Mr Ciolis: Good evening and thank you for giving me this opportunity. I guess I am here as a concerned Canadian.

I want to say that I fell in love with Canada on 3 November 1962 at about 4 p.m. I remember it was snowing, of course, and Dorval airport appeared as a mysterious place, and yet as I stepped down from the plane I said aloud, and I remember as if it were today: "I am in Canada. This is going to be my new country. I am going to build my life here and I am going to speak English and French."

I was astonished that in Toronto no one spoke French, and that in high school we did not study Canadian history or Canadian literature, but we did learn a lot about the American Civil War with footnotes on the runaway slaves and the underground railway to Canada, and about British history, although, again strange to me, nothing about French history. If Canada was founded by the English and the French, should we not study both histories if we accept the premise that we need to study our heritage, or do we care about only half our past?

The first few years of growing up Canadian I felt intellectually half naked. Then I discovered Montreal and Monique Lerac, Leonard Cohen and Robert Charlebois. I discovered Quebec City and the cultural pride and the historical pain compressed like a black hole in that slogan, *Je me souviens*. Through the tears, the shivers brought on by the subfreezing weather and the too many beers of a 17-year-old Cree Indian, I also discovered the mistreatment of our native people.

In Toronto I discovered Gordon Lightfoot and Stephen Leacock and by 1967 I had found my Canada, with all its splendid qualities and its wonderful people and its regional, parochial, asinine expressions of unilingual, unicultural bigotry. In 1967 we celebrated our centennial. Today with obtuse balkanized minds flying with rampant, selfish, egoistical political greed, we are marching backwards into prejudice, into bigotry and into the living splendour of two solitudes.

Today I ask you not to discuss mediocrity, not to examine selfishness, but to stand up for excellence, the greatness, the human richness, the cultural vitality that our Canada can be. Only together we are truly Canadian, and Canada exists only as a whole, just as our individual families can exist only in their complete form.

I do not want you to go on to speak for Ontario, and I do not want you to speak for English Canada, but I beg you as a committee to speak for Canada. Think about it. It is absolute nonsense to state that there are two Canadas. There is only one Canada, and there is no Canada without one of its parts.

Yet our whole discussion on the need for a new constitutional agreement has clearly defined trenches—it is "us" against "them." All our political forces and all our experts are talking of the new division of power. Our Constitution

should not celebrate divisions, but define the greatness of bonds, of our nationhood.

The Constitution is not simply a document of rights and obligations and jurisdictions. Our Constitution should hold sacred the soul of our nation, of our people, and we are one people. My French-speaking compatriots do not need a "distinct society" clause. I consider them my equals and not second-class citizens. Our Constitution should hold that Canada is one nation founded by two linguistic groups, and that Canada has one culture born from the coming together of the people of the world.

Canada itself is a distinct society. There should be no special privileges for one group, no "distinct society" clauses, no pork-barrel multiculturalism. We are Canadians, residents of Ontario, and we hold within us the richness of our Acadian, our Maritime and Quebec heritage, just as much as we hold dear and have been shaped by the people of the Prairies and those living in the Rockies regions. And within us we hold dear, I think, a most sacred trust and privilege, to respect, maintain, appreciate and uphold the culture, the heritage and the reality of our native people.

I ask you to put forth a vision of Canada that is pluralistic in its politics, democratic in its institutions and its laws, just in its social norms, rich in its culture, homogeneous in its identity.

When I visit relatives in Italy, they say that I do not think like an Italian. They are right. I am a Canadian, proud of it, and I think as a Canadian. From sea to sea we are one people, building a great nation and developing a culture which embraces the world. Let us then articulate our rebirth as a nation not by seeking to defend or acquire new powers, but by recognizing the rights and contributions of all our citizens to the development of Canada. I know that my children are special. Their cultural heritage is the world and they are growing up proud of all they have.

I learned about the love for liberty from my geography teacher. He came from Latvia. I understood what it meant to die for democracy from my friends of Hungarian origin. My friends born in Iraq have given me a deeper appreciation of human rights.

I am proud of great Canadians such as Beck, Champlain, Bethune, Laura Secord, Macdonald, Laurier, Margaret Atwood, Marshall McLuhan, Mowat; sports figures like Esposito, Gretsky, Beliveau and Hull; scientists like Banting and Best, and thousands more.

I am proud of those Canadians that built our railways across this land and of those that opened up the west, and those that build our roads and skyscrapers, and those that dug coal in Cape Breton or fished off the shores of the Grand Banks; people, all of these, who came from across the world, people who have all become proud Canadians, and hundreds of them have died for this land.

My Canadian identity is rich from the best the world can offer. Tell me, of what culture, of what language should I be afraid, and why?

Only if we are confident in ourselves, in our culture, in our identity, can we appreciate and dialogue with all other cultures. We are not perfect. Let us then open our hearts and our minds and seek to understand others as we would

like others to understand us. We should start this process among ourselves in Canada because we have let regional petty interests and hunger for power blind us to the need and rights of our brothers across the land.

2040

Our constitution must clearly recognize the linguistic duality of our country and Canada should be a bilingual nation from sea to sea. Our education system should be driven by a federal education act, and all academic diplomas, degrees, licences and professional certificates issued in one province should be recognized across Canada. French and English should be mandatory subjects from kindergarten to the end of high school. No tricky barriers of commerce duties should exist between our provinces.

We can have the Senate become an elected body and all provinces, territories and native people would elect an equal number of representatives. our constitution I think should recognize and uphold the sovereignty of the native nation within Canada, and please ladies and gentlemen, let's stop defining Canadians by their birth origins. I am a Canadian, period.

Perhaps I have been sounding too idealistic, but look at the bottom line: there is not one single geographic reason for Canada to exist. The opposite is probably true. There is not one single economic reason for Canada to exist. The opposite is probably true. Canada exists only because we want it to exist. It is in our heart and it is in our soul. Canada is a commitment. Canada is a state of mind. Canada to me is also a dream and a very special hope. Canada is the way we choose to live our lives and raise our children. I ask you to dream too, to be courageous and innovative, to be proud of Canada and seek a constitution that upholds our unity, not one that divides powers.

Seek a constitution that celebrates Canada and not one that legalizes regional envies. Seek and celebrate the soul of this country and of our people, because in the final analysis Canada is people, not powers. Canada is us, together, or nothing at all.

The Chair: Mr Ciolsi, there are two people on the list to question. If we are both brief with the questions and the answers, we can probably get through them.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much for your presentation. It was very fascinating and it helped me to better understand the situation. You were talking about the federal powers and the cultural richness by sharing. That sharing will help us to understand each other. Do you feel it will help to reduce the division between us?

Mr Ciolsi: I think if we approach the Constitution by looking at the problems and how can we best solve these problems, instead of which powers shall we define, and approach this problem, then we are probably half way through winning the battle.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You certainly have made Canada your country. You say that you did not study Canadian history as such. You certainly have studied Canadian history in your own way and you are an example. I liked one of your phrases when you said, "Canada exists because we want it to exist." I think if you have really studied Canadian history, that is true. You gave the reasons for that.

We know it cannot exist the way it is. I think if we are real at all, and you are idealistic and I tend to have some of those qualities, we know that however much we have all these ideals and values, we are at a crossroads. I am wondering if you could say a little bit more about the best road to follow. I know you have said we cannot talk about powers, but could you say a little bit more about a recommendation that this committee could make that would build on some of the ideas you have presented?

Mr Ciolsi: I think one of the key points for us is to understand and certainly make our French compatriots feel at home within this nation, to make them first of all realize that Canada is their nation, that their nation is not limited to one province. Therefore, I think if we a priori accept the bilingual duality, the bilingual aspects of this nation, then we are probably extending the hand to discuss all the other problems that you can try to work out.

There has to be a compromise and there has to be some give and take, but what I was trying to stress was that the obtaining of power should not be a priority as much as the solution of a certain difference of opinion becomes a priority and then we work out a mechanism by which we apply our solution.

RIK GATES

The Chair: I call Rik Gates.

Mr Gates: You are probably all wondering why I called you here this evening. I have always wanted to say that.

My name is Rik Gates and I just moved to Toronto a year ago. I am from Nova Scotia. First, I would like to thank you, members of the committee, for giving me this opportunity tonight to be able to express my views of the country and how I feel, and I will attempt to express my views of 25 years in the time allotted for me this evening, so please bear with me.

I am very intrigued and yet somewhat bewildered at all these committees and commissions that have been formed over the past few months, and I will expand on this later in my presentation.

As an individual, since I am not representing any specific group, there are three areas that I feel that need to be addressed by the leaders of Ontario and Canada, and these are just basically my views. I am sure other Canadians think other issues are more pertinent.

One is Canada's leadership in the political system as a whole; two, the native people; and three, regional disparity.

On the first issue, our leadership and our political system, this is definitely the most important factor in keeping Canada together, since it will be leadership that will pull Canada out of this post-Meech mess.

This issue relates directly to my earlier statement as to my wonder and bewilderment at all these new committees that are now studying Canada's future. Over the past few months we have seen the formation of Canada's Spicer commission, Quebec's Bélanger-Campeau commission and now the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. I am intrigued because nothing like this has ever happened before in Canadian politics.

I am bewildered because, why now? Where were these committees and commissions before Meech Lake? Why are political leaders in all levels of government reactionaries? It is so easy for someone to set up a committee after the event, after Meech Lake had failed, but it takes a real leader to foresee a potential crisis and create a solution through consensus.

Where are the visionaries who will lead Canada into the 21st century? It was real leaders of all political stripes who helped Canada grow into the nation it is today, leaders who challenged us and challenged society. Whether it was been greater independence from Great Britain in the beginning, or creating a medicare system envied by other countries around the world, a Bill of Rights, our own Constitution, vast social programs aimed at assisting all Canadians or just even promoting our multiculturalism, it took leaders with a vision for Canada.

All these committees and commissions should have been set up before Meech Lake, not after. We should have learned that even the government that patriated the Constitution in 1982 used a very flawed system, and that itself almost self-destructed.

It kind of reminds me of the sinking of the Titanic. It was not until after the ship had sunk that a commission was set up and realized that with a few more lifeboats possibly everyone could have been saved. The shipbuilder did not have the foresight to see the potential disaster, as with our present leaders. But as a Canadian, I refuse to sit on the deck and play a piano while the ship is sinking and Quebec jumps ship.

Canada is not just in an economic recession; worse, we are in a political depression. If you, as representatives of the Ontario government, want concrete recommendations and not just generalities as to how to fill this political vacuum, then this committee is one perfect example. This committee is an excellent idea, but I am afraid it may be a bit too late. It is the timing, the lack of vision for Canada. Canada cannot keep plotting a course for the future day by day.

2050

Meech Lake was a perfect example of what Canada needed: compromise. Meech Lake, with all its flaws, was good for Canada, because everyone compromised. It was not Meech Lake itself which led to its destruction; it was the secretive process which gave it its birth in the first place.

I do not believe governments are re-elected based on numbers, as they like to believe. History has shown us that governments have been elected and re-elected no matter what the deficit, the inflation or the unemployment rate was. If that was the case, I am sure previous governments never would have been re-elected. Rather, they were elected on their principles, honesty and openness. This is probably another recommendation: openness. We are seeing more of it now and it is most welcome. But it was not until after years and years of secretive negotiations and closed-door meetings that the public finally had enough and is now demanding a change. I think we saw that last June when Mulroney and the 11 ministers all rolled the dice. Politicians are polling everything they are doing and

saying and reacting to every little decision. Our leaders are not leading a nation but are finding themselves being led.

My second point this evening is the native people. Since the time of Confederation each province has been granted certain powers and a form of self-government. The French have their own province and their own laws and powers to protect their heritage, yet the native people of this land have been by and large ignored. After 124 years of royal commission after royal commission studying every aspect of the native people, nothing has really been done. Finally did Canada witness the native peoples' frustration last summer.

Canadians have this uncanny ability to accept this situation as an unfortunate mistake in our history, with no real commitment to change. A perfect example of this was the events of last summer. During the standoff at Oka, we witnessed genuine support and sympathy for the Mohawks. But as soon as the issue was resolved, both the federal government and we as a society seemed almost immediately to put it behind us.

If we sit by and do nothing, we will certainly be reacting again to an even greater crisis. But as potential visionaries, which I believe we all are, we have a great opportunity to start righting some wrongs. We need to start acting now. Native people need self-government, but giving self-government only to the native people of Ontario will help the native people of this province and leave others out of the process to fend with their own governments, which will probably each have different priorities.

Ontario needs to encourage the other provinces to join the federal government in setting up governing councils in each of the provinces. These governing councils would have independent laws and powers to protect their culture, their language and race, yet work within the laws of Canada. As it would be very difficult to set up a separate province for the native people, guaranteed national representation would be needed in the federal government through the House of Commons, the Senate and the Supreme Court of Canada. This representation would be entrenched in Canada's Constitution. By granting the native people these basic rights and powers, they would be on the road towards self-respect and dignity, something that is long overdue to one of the founding members of this nation.

This may seem a little extreme, but I am going to use it anyway. We know apartheid is not practised in Canada as it is in South Africa, but I do find some very ironic similarities. Sure, we can say the native people are free to live anywhere they want in Canada, that they are as free as you and me here in this room, but are they really? Democratic freedom may be there in theory, but is it there in spirit? The native people are not as free as we like to think they are. Our educational system is certainly not designed for them. They were put on reservations, which took away their independence. They are now dependent on a system that never really worked for them. Compare the townships of South Africa with the reservations here in Canada. They have many things in common: the higher death rates, the higher crime rates, alcoholism—the list goes on and on. I find it very hard to call them the native people of Canada. I

do not believe they feel they are part of Canada, and I do not know if they want to be associated with Canada.

We as a society have done far better integrating people from other lands and cultures than we have with the native people here. If we continue to ignore addressing the real issues of the native people in the next few years, I believe the world community will view Canada as a totally different country from the generous one it is viewed as today. But far worse is the possibility that Canadians and the native people may lose the one last chance to live together in peace and harmony.

My last point is regional disparity. Regional tensions have varied over the past 124 years. It usually has been between Ottawa and the provinces and not directly between the provinces themselves. Why is that? I believe it derives from two things: power and money.

First, power: Each of the provinces basically has the same amount of powers as handed out in the British North America Act of 1867. That we know. But each province can individually negotiate for more powers or for more money from the federal government, as we have seen with the Quebec government striking a deal with the federal government over immigration. This is where the identical powers of each of the provinces under the BNA Act become misleading. The true power and influence comes from the number of the province's MPs in the House of Commons. The province with the more seats in the House of Commons usually finds it easier to deal with the federal government and to get what it wants. This indirectly causes regionalism.

It is for this reason that many westerners and the maritime provinces feel neglected by the federal government. Many westerners and Maritimers feel that central Canada is catered to: as Ontario and Quebec hold 174 of the 295 seats, almost 60%, it only makes political sense that a federal government would tend to be more sensitive to their needs. So giving provincial governments more federal powers would not necessarily make them more equal, as they would still rely on transfer payments from the federal government, and with the status quo in the House of Commons remaining the same, the federal government would still cater to the needs of Quebec and Ontario in order to remain in power come the next federal election.

Ontario and the other provinces must also keep in mind that they can barely afford to fund the programs that are already under their jurisdiction even with the present transfer payments from the federal government. Between 1984 and 1986, the federal government cut transfer payments to the provinces by some \$6 billion. If Ontario and the other provinces want more federal powers transferred to them, it would only make sense if these powers were already duplicated by both levels of government and if a definite guarantee of funding were to come from the federal government.

As the provinces are going to look out for their interests first and foremost, and with the representation in the House of Commons remaining the same, it would be nearly impossible to erase regionalism from Canada's political landscape. But one arm of the parliamentary system which could give more powers to the provinces yet make

the House of Commons more democratic to the needs of all regions of Canada would be the restructuring of the Senate. By creating an equal, elected and effective Senate, all regions of Canada would have the same power and influence in the federal government and the end result would be less regionalism in Canada. The Senate could prevent unnecessary catering to the more powerful provinces in the House of Commons, creating a more equal and democratic country.

But one thing that cannot stop regionalism, unfortunately, is ignorance, and ignorance knows no borders. It is leaders such as these who make hasty comments or uneducated decisions which could have a profound effect on the other regions and the nation as a whole. When it comes to dealing with the Constitution, Canada's 11 first ministers must rise above partisan and regional politics. An example would be Quebec's recently released Allaire report. We do not need leaders making comments that may win them political points at home, but rather benefit Canada as a whole. We need compassionate leaders who can understand Quebec's frustration and that the Allaire report is at least another start. Ontario should be embracing that initiative. By stating that this and that is wrong with the Allaire report, Ontario would be sending a signal to the people of Quebec that we are in no mood to listen and negotiate. We must proceed with a cautious, patient and positive approach.

Canada, for the first time in its history, has the possibility of breaking up, for it is not just Quebec that is unhappy with the present form of federalism. It seems that over the past few months Canada's identity or its soul, whatever you want to call it, has changed from regions who worked together to build a nation to a nation falling apart because of its regions. I find that a very ironic demise, and hopefully this committee will be able to do something about that. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Gates.

2100

Mr Bisson: You raised a couple of interesting points that I was mulling over as you were speaking. It seems to me that maybe one of the problems we have is that we somehow are trying to change the way we think, change the way we do things when it comes to our federal and provincial governments, with regard to imposing guidelines and saying things have to be done in a neat, orderly, business fashion. Unfortunately—and fortunately at the same time—the country is much more than an accident in the whole democratic process.

You said part of the problem we have is that the structure of the federal system is that the province with the most seats in the House is the one that gets the most attention, and you gave us an alternative of having an elected Senate. I do not want to get so much into a debate on the Senate but a debate around the House of Commons. There is an argument on one side that if the House of Commons has to have equal representation by the provinces, how do you recognize that Ontario clearly has the majority of the population of this country? And Quebec would get equal representation to, let's say, PEI or British Columbia and vice versa. How do you address that?

Mr Gates: That is where the Senate would offset the imbalance in the House of Commons. By looking at the present system as it is, Atlantic Canada only has 32 seats, and whether it would be fair for us to have the same amount of seats as Ontario and Quebec, which have two-thirds of the population—I do not think that would be acceptable.

But the Senate could balance that catering; by making it elected and effective it could subvert any programs the federal government would benefit Ontario and Quebec. Right now, it looks as if it would maybe take some of the heat off the provinces, because whenever a Premier of a province speaks up, he is speaking to that region. When you have 11 men or women in a room fighting, that creates regionalism. But if you took it off that and you took it from one man or woman, the head of a province, to maybe 10 or 15 or 20, whatever the amount of seats per province, I think that would also break the regionalism. You would not have the Premier of Nova Scotia saying, "I speak for Nova Scotia federally." No, he does not. The Senate does. I think that would help break regionalism in Canada.

The Chair: We are going to move on. Thank you, Mr Gates.

We have two other speakers who had been given to understand that they would be heard this evening. I would like, with the forbearance of the committee, to move to them now. We will ask the speakers to be as brief as they can.

DAVID HUBAND

Mr Huband: My name is David Huband. I am an actor-comedian, and I have been living and sometimes working in Toronto for the last nine years.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak before this committee tonight. In the past, issues such as Meech Lake and the free trade debate have totally excluded the voting public in the political process, and it is a welcome change that ordinary citizens such as myself have a chance to be part of the dialogue in determining the future of Canada. For that, I once again thank the committee for allowing me to be part of that dialogue.

I really had no idea what I wanted to talk to you about today, so thank you and good night.

I was talking to a friend of mine last week about a really bad television show on the CBC called *Urban Angel*. It is a new show. My friend asked me why it was so bad and I said, "It tries too hard to be like a typical American cop show." All the elements are there—the violence, drugs, prostitutes, the obligatory car chase—but somehow it just did not cut it. It was missing something. I said, "You know, I wish Canadian producers would come up with a television show that truly reflects the Canadian experience." My friend asked me, "What would that be?" And I said, "I don't know." I was really stumped.

I guess before you can come up with a show that reflects the Canadian identity, first of all you have to come up with a Canadian identity. What does Canada stand for? What does it mean to be a Canadian? Our people have been grappling with these questions virtually since our inception as a nation. We can look to our past for some clues

and find that we have deep-rooted ties with the British, the French and native peoples. We can look to the present and find that the Americans have a huge influence on our daily lives, but what of the future? What will influence us or define us as a people in the 21st century? I asked a lot of my friends and a lot of people in the last little while, "What would you define as being the Canadian identity?" Most everyone said "nice." We are a nice people, Canada is a nice place to live. We exude niceness. Well, is that it? Will Canada be doomed to go down in history as being a nice nation? Surely there must be more to it than that.

The whole question of whether Quebec will separate or not has really made me wonder what it means to be a Canadian, and I do not think we have it figured out yet. I do think Quebecers have a strong sense of identity, a strong sense of who they are and where they want to go.

The issue of separatism has been around for decades, but I never really took it seriously until the dramatic changes in eastern Europe occurred about two years ago. To this day, it boggles my mind that the two Germanys are united and the Warsaw Pact has virtually been dismantled.

Even recent events in the Baltic states demonstrate that here you have ethnic cultures and peoples who are clamouring for their independence. They have long been suppressed and they want their freedom from a large monolithic state which does not recognize their distinct societies. Where have I heard that before?

If such monumental change can occur in eastern Europe, then it surely can occur here in Canada, and I suggest that such a change might not necessarily be a bad thing. Who knows? If Quebec were to separate, it might just be the catalyst that brings the rest of the country together, that defines us as a nation.

I am not so naïve or idealistic to assume that there would not be problems associated with a split, nor am I advocating one. Economically, it would be extremely painful for Quebec as well as the rest of Canada, and the hardships would be unbelievable. Geopolitically it would further isolate the Atlantic provinces from the rest of the country and only add to their growing sense of being ignored on a federal level. Were Quebec to secede, it might even fractionize the western provinces, already distrustful of Ontario. It might just break apart the country.

But I tend to think not. Perhaps I am being unduly optimistic, but I think if Quebec were to separate, it would unite the rest of Canada. We would be fighting to hold on to our country. We would be a part of history, of forging an identity and redefining our nation for centuries to come. We would not be nice. That prospect I find very exciting. Of course, I could be wrong. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Huband.

ALLIANCE HAÏTIENNE

The Chair: Our final speaker, Pierre-Eddy Toussaint from the Alliance haïtienne.

M. Toussaint : Monsieur le Président, mesdames, messieurs du comité spécial sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération canadienne, durant votre vie de citoyens canadiens par naissance ou par naturalisation ou durant l'exercice de votre mandat parlementaire à titre de

député du peuple, vous avez sans doute vu quelque part les inscriptions suivantes : «Honi soit qui mal y pense ; Dieu et mon droit ; Maintiens le droit».

Il serait intéressant de savoir combien d'entre vous savent réellement d'où viennent ces mots ; combien sont capables de les lire correctement. Combien sont capables de l'écrire et combien en connaissent la signification ? N'éprouvez aucun embarras à révéler votre niveau de difficulté à ces interrogations. On estime que près de 80% à 85% de la majorité constitutionnelle du Canada faillirait ce petit test de civisme sur l'histoire et la culture de l'état juridique fondé par la lignée européenne des peuples fondateurs, car en effet, le Canada historique précède le Canada juridique.

Avant Jacques Cartier, Champlain, Giovanni Caboto et autres explorateurs nordiques, il y avait des autochtones du Nord et du Sud. Lorsque les Européens décidèrent de s'établir sur cette partie du continent qu'ils appelleraient plus tard «Amérique», ils eurent recours également aux services des peuples d'autres races amenés d'autres continents. C'est ainsi que le premier nègre d'Afrique sur le continent Nord-Américain est retracé dans la première moitié du 17^e siècle au côté de Samuel de Champlain, à titre de traducteur entre l'explorateur français et les peuples autochtones.

2110

Remarquez bien que, jusqu'à l'heure où je vous parle, les peuples fondateurs de l'état juridique du Canada n'ont encore ni jugé bon de solliciter du Vatican d'auréoler Mathieu De Costa de la béatitude de saint patron des traducteurs canadiens, ni de lui ériger un monument ou de faire porter son nom à un pont, une rivière, une école, une montagne, une ville, une rue, alors qu'à l'égal, des pères de la Confédération, Champlain, Cartier, Montcalm, Wolfe, Macdonald sont honorés sous mille formes en signe de patriotisme canadien.

Sur le plan spirituel de la foi catholique, les Saints Martyrs dont la tragique épopée précède la Confédération, selon la version eurocentrique, sont effectivement béatifiés tout comme le seront successivement Marguerite Bourgeoys, Marguerite d'Youville et l'autochtone Tekakwitha dans la deuxième moitié du siècle courant.

Vient enfin 1867. Après que leur pénétration sur cette terre ait été facilitée tant par un représentant de la race noire que par les autochtones eux-mêmes, les descendants du premier, c'est-à-dire les peuples noirs, seront mis en esclavage en Nouvelle-France, pratique honteuse qui atteindra son point culminant par l'exécution de Marie-Joseph Angélique au bûcher pour tentative de fuite de l'habitation de ses maîtres français.

Quant aux autochtones, après avoir subi l'insulte de voir imposer une nouvelle identité ethnoculturelle en compensation de l'erreur monumentale d'un illustre voyageur qui allait prouver au reste du monde malgré lui que la terre était bien ronde, les nouveaux Indiens d'Amérique, comme on les appelle, devront se faire à l'idée qu'ils ont été découverts, alors que c'est eux qui avaient découvert des étrangers perdus sur leur plage.

Ils seront ensuite exterminés, leurs terres dérobées pour donner lieu à un espace vital et fertile divisé en Haut-Canada

et en Bas-Canada à l'usage des Européens, alors que ces Indiens devaient se contenter d'espaces plus restreints appelés réserves.

Les rivalités tribales du continent européen avaient amené leur tissu d'hostilité et de convoitise sur la terre conquise. Après que le plus fort l'eut emporté sur le plus faible, on assista à un phénomène de conquête très rare entre peuples et armées adverses. Pour des raisons de stratégie militaire et de survie ethnoculturelle, le concurrent accepta que l'armée vaincue et son peuple garderait leur langue, leur culture, leur religion, leurs lois fondamentales et une des lois fondamentales de leur pays d'origine, le Code civil. C'est sur cette tradition de principe — gentleman's agreement, qu'on dit dans la langue de Shakespeare — du respect juridique et constitutionnel de la minorité que le Canada de 1867 allait voir le jour.

La Confédération canadienne, plus tard appelée Dominion, était née avec comme souverain le chef régnant de la Couronne britannique dont les armoiries portaient depuis déjà deux siècles l'inscription «Honi soit qui mal y pense ; Dieu et mon droit».

Si Mathieu De Costa doit être proclamé dans les 12 prochains mois apôtre du multiculturalisme canadien en attendant que sa Sainteté le pape Jean-Paul II, lors de sa prochaine visite chez les autochtones, l'élève à la béatitude, il n'est pas exclu, pour quiconque a un certain sens de l'histoire des peuples et de l'évolution des langues, de constater que le bilinguisme, avant d'être un produit canadien, est enraciné dans la Couronne britannique, gardienne d'une culture et d'une langue qui compte plus de 60% de mots d'origine française.

Je vous invite donc à conclure avec moi et à déclarer solennellement que toute opposition à la politique des langues officielles du Canada, toute campagne haineuse contre le bilinguisme est une insulte à la Couronne britannique et à la reine du Canada, Sa Majesté Elizabeth II qui, à chaque tournée de son royaume canadien d'Amérique du Nord, se fait un honneur, un devoir et un plaisir de s'exprimer dans les deux langues officielles par le truchement d'un niveau de français normatif jusque-là incontesté par aucun académicien français, par aucun linguiste ou philologue du monde.

Tant et aussi longtemps que la Couronne britannique de la reine du Canada ou de son futur roi portera des inscriptions françaises sur ses armoiries, le Canada n'aura d'autre choix que de rester un pays bilingue avec le français et l'anglais comme langues de communication, à moins que le Canada anglais ne veuille envoyer un message de désaveux à Sa Majesté britannique, forme de chantage qui voudrait dire : «Ici on ne veut pas de français, alors avant de nous visiter, Majesté, vous feriez mieux de vous débarrasser des inscriptions françaises qui se trouvent sur vos armoiries. On est un pays unilingue anglais».

De même, ceux qui pensent que le départ du Québec de la Confédération signifie la fin du bilinguisme canadien se trompent grandement. En diverses parties du Canada et particulièrement en Ontario, des gens d'expression française sont venus de partout et se sont intégrés à la collectivité francophone de cette province alors qu'elle n'était même pas encore dotée de toutes les institutions démocratiques

qui pourraient la rendre juridiquement et constitutionnellement viable.

Historiquement, la communauté francophone a survécu par simple question de volonté, de détermination et de fierté collective des membres de cette communauté. De nos jours, grâce à l'immigration et en dépit de certains vents politiques qui pourraient lui être contraires, la francophonie est encore plus vibrante qu'elle ne l'était hier et ceci, que le Québec reste ou pas au sein de la Confédération.

La francophonie canadienne, particulièrement en Ontario, n'a plus besoin d'être riviée au Québec pour garantir son alimentation culturelle parce qu'elle est justement dotée de cette dimension multiculturelle et interracial qui fait sa richesse, sa force et sa nouvelle vitalité. La francophonie ontarienne est à l'heure de la francophonie internationale. Le monde de chez nous, c'est le monde de partout.

Je suis un citoyen canadien de race noire, d'expression française et d'origine haïtienne. Mes enfants sont des Franco-Ontariens de race noire, d'expression française et de descendance haïtienne. En effet, en arrivant dans ce pays, j'ai fait le choix de vivre dans l'une de ces deux langues officielles, laquelle se trouvait à être la langue officielle de mon pays d'origine.

Monsieur Silipo, vous et vos parents, n'ayant pas eu cette chance-là, vous avez choisi d'être Canadien d'expression anglaise d'origine ou de descendance italienne. Joe Fratesi a obéi à la même logique à Sault-Sainte-Marie, mais je pourrais également vous citer au Québec bon nombre de familles canadiennes-françaises d'origine ou de descendance italienne. Je suis un enseignant du système catholique de Toronto. C'est le cas de plusieurs parents de mes élèves de North York qui sont également de descendance italienne avec un cousin, un oncle, un petit neveu, une tante francophone à Montréal.

Connaissez-vous le chroniqueur Pierre Foglia ; le professeur Roberto Perrin de l'Université de Toronto ici à Toronto ; et installée depuis une dizaine d'années dans la banlieue torontoise de Brampton, la famille Gandolfo ? Ce sont des Canadiens français de descendance italienne.

Je n'ai pas demandé d'être nègre dans une peau noire. Mais aussi, c'est seulement des contingences historiques qui expliquent le fait que je sois francophone. Si, au nom du principe de l'autodétermination des peuples et de leurs droits à la migration garantis par la Charte des Nations Unies, il est permis à tout être humain de changer de nationalité, il y a quelque chose qui ne m'est pas encore possible ou permis : c'est de changer la couleur de ma peau ou de ma condition raciale.

Dans le contexte juridique, politique et constitutionnel canadien, j'ai également fait le choix de rester francophone au Canada et de me battre pour que le statut du français en Ontario et au Canada continue à jouir de toutes les garanties constitutionnelles qui permettent à une langue, à une culture et à une collectivité de même appartenance de s'épanouir sainement.

Détrompez-vous, je ne fais pas la lutte des Franco-Ontariens. Je ne suis pas francophone pour les Franco-Ontariens ; je suis francophone parce que je suis fier de l'être. Si ça peut aider la cause des Franco-Ontariens, pourquoi pas ? Je suis francophone parce que dans le pays

du Canada, cela me permet de tirer certains avantages personnels sur le plan culturel, sur le plan politique, sur le plan économique ou encore, cela permet à des gens de même condition ethnoculturelle et raciale que moi de tirer des bénéfices de ces conditions-là. Il ne serait peut-être pas d'ailleurs malavisé de vous conseiller d'apporter ce message au parti gouvernemental et à vos collègues de la Législature ontarienne.

Dans toutes mesures législatives ou dispositions administratives du gouvernement concernant la collectivité francophone, les membres des communautés ethnoculturelles francophones de l'Ontario veulent être systématiquement et régulièrement pris en considération : Noirs, Asiatiques, femmes, Juifs, musulmans, protestants, handicapés et même ceux qui sont d'orientation sexuelle différente, de la même façon que vous, Monsieur le député, anglophone et francophile de descendance italienne, il vous est donné le privilège aujourd'hui de présider dans une province majoritairement anglaise un comité politique sur le rôle de l'Ontario dans la Confédération.

2120

Sur plus de soixante organismes francophones de la région torontoise, il y en a à peu près une douzaine qui sont des organismes ethnoculturels : les Français, les Haïtiens, les Égyptiens, les Marocains, les Zairois, les Maghrébins et sans compter les groupes nationaux qui ne sont pas constitués encore en organismes pour une raison ou pour une autre.

Je m'en voudrais de ne pas aborder ce dialogue avec vous en laissant de côté la dimension raciale au profit de la problématique linguistique. Lorsque la problématique linguistique sera réglée au Canada, tant au sein de la communauté francophone qu'au sein de la communauté anglophone, la question des relations interraciales restera un défi pour l'ensemble de la société ontarienne. Ceci est d'autant plus vrai qu'il y a une nouvelle classe de citoyens qui risque d'être victime de multiples injustices dans la perception biaisée d'une catégorie ou d'ensemble de catégories raciales et ethnoculturelles de cette société. Il s'agit des Noirs d'expression française d'origine haïtienne en grande majorité, mais aussi d'origine martiniquaise et de différentes origines nationales africaines. Je m'inquiète particulièrement du sort de nos femmes qui, en plus de l'identité raciale, linguistique et de la nationalité d'origine, doivent aussi assumer d'une identité minoritaire dont elles ne peuvent se défaire : leur condition féminine.

Dans l'aménagement en personnel, c'est-à-dire les employés des institutions tant anglophones que francophones, votre gouvernement devra passer des instructions à ses agences ministérielles et autres commissions pour qu'on en tienne compte.

Dans vos rapports avec la communauté noire locale au niveau provincial, il y aura lieu que vous en teniez compte et que les politiques des ministères des affaires francophones et des affaires civiques en tiennent compte également, tant l'accessibilité, tant leurs services que leurs positions, nominations, embauches disponibles à tous les échelons.

Plusieurs membres du segment francophone de la communauté noire se dévouent au-delà d'une vingtaine d'années

dans la vie communautaire et professionnelle en Ontario et se distinguent tant dans l'action bénévole que dans leur milieu de travail. Loin de chercher pour eux des bénéfices politiques personnels que les esprits malins auraient trop de plaisir à associer au patronage, il y aurait lieu d'envisager, de reconnaître leur patrimoine culturel en l'intégrant à la mosaïque multiculturelle de la société ontarienne globale. Je pense à la réhabilitation de Marie-Joseph Angélique, sinon par le texte législatif mais par des mesures administratives qui encouragent les citoyens canadiens de toutes races à abhorrer l'exploitation de l'être humain qu'était l'esclavage et ses ravages.

Je pense à l'hommage plus que centenaire que l'on doit à Mathieu De Costa. C'est beau de se mettre au diapason de la société mondiale contemporaine et d'honorer Mandela, Martin Luther King. Quand on sait que les ancêtres européens des deux peuples fondateurs, peu importe qu'ils aient vécu en Europe ou avant la création de la Confédération, quand on sait que les ancêtres européens des deux peuples fondateurs ont bénéficié et continuent à bénéficier de toutes sortes d'hommages qui sur le plan culturel et éducatif renforcent le sens de l'identification au héros et le désir de s'en inspirer comme modèle, on ne peut qu'espérer que, pour les segments ethnoculturels de la population canadienne, ce processus se poursuivra.

Si Dollard des Ormeaux peut être honoré par exemple au Québec, je ne vois pas pourquoi nos élèves de race noire devraient être dans l'impossibilité de commémorer le 200^e anniversaire de la mort de Toussaint-Louverture, en même temps que leurs camarades d'autres races pourraient apprendre comment un homme de race noire s'est mérité une place dans l'histoire du monde. Je ne verrais pas d'un mauvais oeil qu'en collaboration avec un régime démocratique installé en Haïti, le gouvernement provincial habilite TVOntario à rédiger un documentaire, à monter un documentaire sur la guerre de l'indépendance d'Haïti en vue de célébrer l'an 2004, le 200^e anniversaire de l'accession à l'indépendance de la première république noire du monde.

De pareils projets exigent évidemment que l'Ontario développe des relations extérieures avec des pays francophones à travers le monde. Ce serait donc une opportunité de procéder, à partir d'ici, à un plan d'ébauche moyennant l'utilisation de citoyens de même origine nationale comme personnes-ressources, en tant que consultants ou en tant que membres d'une éventuelle délégation ontarienne dans le pays d'origine où très souvent, en plus du français, langue officielle, on cultive des langues nationales populaires telles que le créole, l'arabe, le lingala, le wolof, le swahili, d'où l'intérêt international d'un Ontario officiellement bilingue ou offrant des services en français plus diversifiés.

N'oubliez pas qu'il y a près de 40 pays à travers le monde qui se réclament de la francophonie et qu'à l'heure actuelle en Ontario, il n'y a à peu près pas un seul de ces pays qui ne possède quelques-uns de ces ressortissants dans la province la plus riche et la plus industrialisée du Canada.

Enfin, avant de vous quitter, permettez que je vous exprime mes sentiments en tant que membre d'une minorité visible francophone face à l'unilinguisme affiché par la ville de Sault-Sainte-Marie et ma façon d'y réagir. Je

trouve qu'il y a eu là un mélange d'intolérance grandissante, d'ignorance et de distorsion de l'histoire et de la réalité politique contemporaine. Ce n'est pas vrai que la politique du bilinguisme officiel menace l'autre langue officielle majoritaire du Canada ; 500 000 dans 8 millions ne serait constituer un danger, et encore moins 6 millions sur 22 millions.

Ce n'est pas vrai que les postes bilingues enlèvent des emplois aux anglophones ; au contraire, la théorie du nombre risque d'être préjudiciable aux francophones si l'enseignement du français langue seconde et l'immersion française continuent d'être un succès à travers la province dans les dix prochaines années à venir. En tant qu'enseignant de français langue seconde, je peux vous en dire quelque chose. Ce ne seront plus les francophones qui détiendront les postes bilingues.

D'ailleurs on n'a qu'à regarder, dans l'enseignement, dans l'ensemble des conseils scolaires de la région torontoise pour voir quels sont les dispensateurs de l'enseignement du français langue seconde. Les services en français ne s'adressent absolument pas aux anglophones, mais aux francophones qui veulent bien jouir de leurs droits constitutionnels pour s'en servir ou non en raison de principe historique fondamental qui est au coeur, à l'origine même de cette nation et la transcendent même.

Au-delà des faits d'armes victorieux, ceux qui se réclament de la grande tradition de noblesse et de chevalerie de l'Empire britannique feraient mieux de comprendre que c'est au nom de ces principes mêmes qui distinguent les conquérants civilisateurs des envahisseurs annihilateurs, que les soldats victorieux de Sa Majesté britannique, sur les plaines d'Abraham, n'ont pas jugé nécessaire d'ajouter l'insulte à l'injure en ne pas dépouillant le vaincu de tous ses attributs culturels, surtout lorsque ce vaincu jure de prêter serment d'allégeance à partir des véhicules d'expression culturelle qu'on voudra bien lui laisser.

Que fallait-il de mieux pour bâtir un rempart linguistique contre une menace des insurgés américains ? Avant comme après la Confédération, les acquis culturels et linguistiques français sauvegardés et garantis tant par les Britanniques que par la majorité canadienne anglaise, ces acquis culturels et linguistiques français ont servis les intérêts du Canada et avec le temps ont été l'élément distinctif de l'identité canadienne.

Comme les temps changent, les conjonctures politiques également évoluent avec elle ; 137 ans de petites injustices et d'autres inégalités à l'égard des Canadiens français ont été corrigées dans un dialogue ferme mais civilisé. C'est l'un des seuls pays au monde qui soit en mesure de faire preuve de tant d'équilibre de sa dualité sans verser dans les violences qui ruinent les ressources matérielles, les infrastructures socioéconomiques, méprisent massivement les vies humaines et déstabilisent la sécurité publique et les institutions politiques.

Dans un continent de 200 millions de parlants anglais, partie intégrante d'un ensemble de 20 millions additionnels, au nombre desquels on peut compter 6 millions de francophones regroupés sur un territoire où ils jouissent d'un pouvoir politique juridictionnel, il faut admettre que le Québec n'est absolument pas une province comme les

autres. Comme dans le genre de société mondiale dans laquelle on est appelé à vivre il n'est pas possible et souhaitable de perpétuer les querelles linguistiques pour une autre période de 130 ans, on doit se rendre à l'évidence qu'on est arrivé au point où il faut autoriser à la seule juridiction territoriale de langue française qui détient un certain pouvoir politique en Amérique de pouvoir en jouir souverainement, que ce soit à l'intérieur ou à l'extérieur du Canada.

Dans l'intervalle, certains citoyens persistent à croire que le départ du Québec de la Confédération, c'est la fin du bilinguisme officiel au Canada. Il faudrait leur en fournir le plus vibrant démenti à moins que certains ne veuillent répéter une édition fin 20^e siècle de la déportation des Acadiens. On voit avec l'exemple du golfe Persique comment pareille entreprise même sous des formes modernisées serait périlleuse, scandaleuse et nuisible à l'image internationale du Canada.

Les vestiges des premiers défricheurs français de la terre des Indiens pullulent à travers le continent américain, et particulièrement à travers l'état juridique du Canada créé conjointement par les descendants des deux groupes culturels en provenance de l'Europe occidentale.

Il est bizarre que ceux qui veulent changer les règles du jeu constitutionnel canadien sont les mêmes qui n'admettraient point qu'on ose toucher à la Magna Carta du Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne. Au coeur du Nouveau-Brunswick, il y a l'Acadie française, au coeur de Toronto, la Ville-Reine il y a le Fort Frontenac. Dans les provinces de l'Ouest, la présence française d'avant la Confédération

est tellement indéniable que ceux qui, par le biais d'une législation provinciale avaient cherché à se soustraire des exigences du bilinguisme institutionnel imposées par la constitution, se sont vus rabroués en Cour supérieure du Canada avec comme punition juridique la traduction dans l'autre langue officielle de ladite province de toutes les lois unilingues anglaises votées jusque-là.

Toute municipalité ontarienne qui veut se payer le luxe de se prévenir contre une disposition législative de la portée de celle des services en français devrait être avertie qu'elle est rayée de la liste de l'itinéraire des visites royales en Ontario, car il est protocolairement embarrassant pour la souveraine d'un pays officiellement bilingue de se rendre en visite dans une ville proclamée unilingue contre une disposition législative qui ne la concerne même pas.

Dans ces termes-là je vous laisse et je vous demande de considérer cette requête de notre vision du Canada de demain.

The Chair: Merci, Monsieur Toussaint. Are there any questions?

That concludes this day here in Toronto. We invite those people who are here and those who may be following our meetings over the parliamentary channel to continue following our meetings, if you are so interested, on the parliamentary channel. We will be adjourning tonight and picking up our meetings tomorrow afternoon in Windsor. With that, we are adjourned.

The committee adjourned at 2133.

CONTENTS

Monday 18 February 1991

Association multiculturelle francophone de l'Ontario	C-449
Christopher Stewart	C-453
Roberto Perin	C-456
John Crispo	C-458
George Forster	C-461
Stan Matias	C-464
Hans Modlich	C-465
Afternoon sitting	C-468
Mrs Edward Ryan	C-468
L. J. Redman	C-468
Peter Lowry	C-470
Ken Hester	C-471
Association canadienne de francophones d'Afrique	C-473
Brian Graff	C-475
Donald Clappison	C-478
Reg Whitaker	C-480
Clay Derstine	C-482
Dialogue Canada, Toronto chapter	C-484
Chris Nair	C-488
Ontario Race Council	C-489
Martin Amber	C-491
Evening sitting	C-493
Subcommittee report	C-493
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-493
National Congress of Filipino Associations	C-496
John Melin, Robert Greenhill, Patrick Pichette and Martin LeBlanc	C-499
Renato Ciolsi	C-504
Rik Gates	C-505
David Huband	C-508
Alliance haïtienne	C-508
Adjournment	C-512

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

MacKinnon, Ellen (Lambton NDP) for Ms Harrington

Villeneuve, Noble (Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry PC) for Mr Harnick

Ward, Brad (Brantford NDP) for Mr F. Wilson

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis**Clerk pro tem:** Brown, Harold**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Murray, Paul, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

CAZON
XC2
-1990
052

Comm
Publ



C-13 1991

C-13 1991

ISSN 1183-3580

Legislative Assembly of Ontario

First Session, 35th Parliament

Official Report of Debates (Hansard)

Tuesday 19 February 1991

Select committee on
Ontario in Confederation

Assemblée législative de l'Ontario

Première session, 35^e législature

Journal des débats (Hansard)

Le mardi 19 février 1991

Comité spécial sur le rôle de
l'Ontario au sein de
la Confédération

Chair: Tony Silipo
Clerk: Tannis Manikel

Président : Tony Silipo
Greffier : Tannis Manikel

Published by the Legislative Assembly of Ontario
Editor of Debates: Don Cameron



Publié par l'Assemblée législative de l'Ontario
Éditeur des débats : Don Cameron

Table of Contents

Table of Contents for proceedings reported in this issue appears at the back, together with a list of committee members and other members taking part.

Reference to a cumulative index of previous issues may be obtained by calling the Hansard Reporting Service indexing staff at (416) 965-2159.

Languages in Hansard

Hansard reports all debates in English or French as spoken by the participants. It does not translate remarks made in either language. Headings and tables of contents reflect language use.

Subscriptions

Subscription information may be obtained from: Sessional Subscription Service, Publications Ontario, Ministry of Government Services, 5th Floor, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M7A 1N8. Phone (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 or toll-free 1-800-668-9938.

Table des matières

La table des matières des séances rapportées dans ce numéro se trouve à l'arrière de ce fascicule, ainsi qu'une liste des membres du comité et des autres députés ayant participé.

Il existe un index cumulatif des numéros précédents. Les renseignements qu'il contient sont à votre disposition par téléphone auprès des employés de l'index du Journal des débats au (416) 965-2159.

Langues paraissant dans le Journal des débats

Le Journal des débats rapporte en anglais ou en français les débats, selon la langue utilisée par les participants. Les remarques faites en l'une ou l'autre langue ne sont pas traduites. La langue des en-têtes et de la table des matières reflète la langue utilisée.

Abonnements

Pour les abonnements, veuillez prendre contact avec le Service d'abonnement parlementaire, Publications Ontario, ministère des Services gouvernementaux, 5^e étage, 880, rue Bay, Toronto (Ontario) M7A 1N8. Par téléphone : (416) 326-5310, 326-5311 ou, sans frais : 1-800-668-9938.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Tuesday 19 February 1991

The committee met at 1536 at the Teutonia Club, Windsor.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order and welcome those people who are here with us in Windsor at the Teutonia Club. This is the select committee on Ontario in Confederation. We are continuing our hearings throughout the province and are here in Windsor today.

We want, first of all, to apologize because of the delay. We have had two weeks of travel throughout the north and central part of the province with the weather co-operating fully, and it was not until we started out from Toronto that we had a problem with fog and being delayed. We have some members of our committee who are missing, who are still on their way trying to get here.

I should also point out that because of the problems we do not have all of our interpreters here. As a result—this is perhaps more of significance to the people who may be following our proceedings over the parliamentary network—for the time being we have only the one interpreter here able to interpret from French into English. We apologize for that to those in the audience and particularly to those people who may be following us through the parliamentary channel who will not be able to follow our proceedings in French. We are trying to rectify that, we are trying to find some additional interpreters. If we are able to do that we will add to that. We thought it was more important to begin the proceedings than to delay much longer, so we will be proceeding in that way. For those people here in the audience who may require interpreting from French into English there are interpreting devices available at the back of the hall, and people can sign those out and use those.

Because of the delay, we are going to sit from now till about 5 o'clock or a little after and then take a short break and come back and go till 9 or afterwards if need be, and try to get through as many of the speakers as we can. I would also ask speakers to help us out by limiting presentations, if you are individuals, to 10 minutes, and to 15 to 20 minutes if you are groups. That is the only way, quite frankly, we are going to be able to get through. Once again, we apologize for that, but it is something outside of our control.

I know that in addition to the people we have on our lists there are other people who have indicated an interest in speaking. We will do our best to accommodate that, but that also will be subject to the time the people who are on the list will take. Again, for that reason we would appreciate your understanding in trying to help us get through as best we can.

ERNEST GUISTE

The Chair: I call Ernest Guiste to come forward.

Mr Guiste: I appreciate this opportunity to share my views with you on the Canadian Constitution and

Ontario's role in the important task of re-evaluating and reconstructing the Canadian Confederation.

Ontarians and all Canadians face a formidable challenge. This challenge lies in defining how and to what extent we will reconstruct the Canadian Confederation. The failure of the Meech Lake constitutional accord and the continuing struggles of Mohawk and aboriginal peoples in our country tell us in no uncertain terms that we must re-evaluate and reconstruct Canadian Confederation if we wish to maintain the Canada we know and love.

The task of reconstruction will be a great one. However, we must not be overwhelmed by the challenge. From our history and the history of other great nations, we have learned that where there is no struggle there is no progress. The task of reconstruction will require a combination of hard work, commitment, compromise and understanding among the parties, namely, the federal government, the provinces and the aboriginal peoples of Canada.

The success or failure of our efforts will be significantly influenced by the manner in which we utilize our recent experience from Meech Lake. If we are to succeed, we must learn from our mistakes. The approach of hammering out a deal and rolling the dice must be avoided.

We must recognize from the outset that our goal is not to rubber-stamp all of Quebec's demands. That is not to say that our goal is to exclude Quebec from Confederation. We must be very cautious of giving away the store or throwing the baby out with the bathwater in an effort to score political points.

The task ahead of us will require much reflection and much dialogue. The process of reflection and dialogue must include Canadians from all walks of life. It will require that as Canadians we reflect on what Canada means to us and what kind of federal relationship we desire. All Canadians must reflect seriously on Quebec's grievances and what Quebec means to us. In addition, Canadians must reflect on the horrid images of Oka and respond to the cries of aboriginal peoples to be treated with respect, dignity and fairness.

Having grown up in Quebec, my Canada includes Quebec. I have very fond memories of my years in Quebec. Anyone who has travelled to Alma, Trois-Rivières or even Montreal can readily testify to the cultural distinctiveness of Quebec. In my view, Quebec's desire to maintain and protect its cultural and linguistic identity is entirely consistent with the Canadian vision of a bilingual, multiracial and multicultural society.

I have great difficulty, however, in accepting the argument that this goal is somehow unattainable in Confederation. I am confident that with a little hard work, some commitment, a bit of compromise and much understanding and dialogue we can be successful in reconstructing Confederation in a manner that will be acceptable to all

Canadians. In my view, any form of reconstruction must include a strong central government.

The new Confederation must be one in which the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed in the charter are respected from coast to coast for all Canadians. The new Confederation must be one in which the federal government can influence and ensure economic stability and prosperity throughout Canada.

Thank you very much. I would be happy to respond to any of your questions.

Mr Malkowski: I appreciate the perspective given us in your presentation. I am wondering what you think of the Allaire report from Quebec and the 22 recommendations of that report. What is your feeling on this?

Mr Guiste: Having reviewed the Allaire report—I would imagine most of us have; it has been pretty predominant in the media—I look at it as a sort of starting point for negotiations. I do not think Anglo-Canadians should view the Allaire report as written in stone. I think Mr Rémillard and other members of Mr Bourassa's caucus have signalled that. I think Quebec is in a situation where, as we all know, there are historical events and consequences that have caused it to be concerned, rightly so, about its linguistic and cultural identity. To respond to the question, I do not think it is written in stone, and I think we should consider it and work from there.

Mr Beer: The question of Quebec's place in Canada and how we deal with that with respect to the other provinces: Is it your view that you would not like to see a Canada in which Quebec had a special status or was said to be a distinct society? Do you think all the provinces, whatever the powers that are distributed, should be the same or can you see a way in which Quebec might be treated differently?

Mr Guiste: As I mentioned in my presentation, the view I take is that it is pretty self-evident that Quebec is a distinct society. When we get into talking constitutional terms, I do not think any province in the country should have greater rights than another province. That is not to say, however, that we are unable to accommodate the interests of Quebec. As I mentioned earlier in my brief, the whole notion of Quebec's interest in its language and culture, etc, can be very adequately accommodated within Confederation. I really am against having a province or any group of Canadians having greater rights than other Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Guiste.

JEAN MONGENAI

The Chair: I call Jean Mongenais.

M. Mongenais : Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, bonjour.

Quelques notes personnelles : je demeure à Windsor depuis l'âge de deux ans. Je suis enseignant ; j'ai enseigné dans les écoles secondaires de la région depuis une trentaine d'années et je suis aussi rédacteur de l'hebdomadaire de langue française de la région qui se nomme Le Rempart.

Je conserve l'optimisme qu'il est encore possible de bâtir ensemble un nouveau pays sur la terre que nous appe-

lons le Canada, mais à mon avis cela n'est possible que s'il est perçu véritablement, de part et d'autre, comme un véritable partenariat où il y a eu égard aux droits et au bien-être des groupes autochtones ainsi que des autres communautés qui sont venues se joindre à nous au cours des années. Il existe quand même un vrai partenariat où les deux groupes linguistiques principaux ont en main tous les outils qu'ils croient nécessaires pour évoluer à titre égal, pour se développer comme communauté culturelle et sociale.

Je ne suis pas du tout expert constitutionnaliste, alors je n'ai pas de suggestions quant aux documents légaux nécessaires pour accomplir cela. D'ailleurs, je crois que ce sont les attitudes des gens et des législateurs qui compteront beaucoup plus parce que même avec une constitution assez souple, si les attitudes convenables n'y sont pas, on n'arrive à rien. Et même avec un document confédératif qui peut paraître un peu plus rigide, si les bonnes attitudes sont là on peut arriver à nos fins. Et c'est justement sur la question d'attitude que je vais vous adresser quelques paroles.

1550

Je crois, j'espère avec raison, qu'un très grand nombre d'anglophones au pays sont prêts à bâtir un pays basé sur ce principe de partenariat et à faire les accommodements nécessaires. Cependant, et surtout au cours des dernières années, ce n'est qu'une petite minorité de ce groupe qui ne partage pas cette vision, qui n'est pas prête à faire les accommodements nécessaires, qui s'exprime le plus.

J'espère que les travaux de cette commission permettront d'une part, au nom du gouvernement de l'Ontario, que ce gouvernement en effet s'exprime clairement dans cet ordre d'idées que je préconise ; deuxièmement, qu'à titre de gouvernement de la province la plus peuplée du pays, il exerce son influence sur les autres gouvernements provinciaux pour les influencer dans ce sens ; et troisièmement, que cette commission invite les anglophones particuliers, groupes petits et gros, qui désirent établir ce genre de partenariat de l'exprimer haut, clairement et fort partout au pays pour que ce soit clair aux francophones qui eux ont exprimé clairement et continuent à exprimer clairement ce qu'ils croient nécessaire pour se sentir à l'aise dans le pays et pour qu'ils puissent croire que la majorité anglophone est prête à dialoguer sur ce principe-là.

Thank you very much.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for your presentation. You were answering my question, as you were proceeding, about the leadership role. You obviously think Ontario should take a leadership role.

Mr Mongenais: Definitely.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Could you say a little more about the specifics of that from your perspective?

Mr Mongenais: In the very recent past, Ontario has gone a long way towards creating the type of society in which both major linguistic groups can feel at home and can have a hand, can possess themselves of the instruments they need to develop culturally. I am obviously talking about the francophones in Ontario. I think there are still some gains to be made, but certainly they have been really great in the last few years, the last 5 or 10 years perhaps. On the one hand, I think we can stand as an

example of an anglophone province, of a majority English province, where the francophones' rights are adequately respected and developed and where the francophones are given the instruments to use themselves to develop as a cultural group. Second, I would hope the politicians of this province can use their influence, on a personal level if necessary, to convince the politicians of other provinces of the possibilities here. Does that answer your question?

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Yes, thank you.

M. Beer : Est-ce que vous pensez que la communauté francophone de l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle avec les Québécois francophones ? Quand vous parlez de partenariats, est-ce qu'il y a quelque chose de spécial que notre communauté francophone peut faire pour mieux expliquer aux Québécois pourquoi il faut quand même essayer de redéfinir le pays, de reconstruire le pays, ou est-ce que vous pensez que ce serait difficile ?

M. Mongenais : La question est nécessairement difficile. Je pense qu'en principe la réponse à votre question est oui, mais il faudrait que je réfléchisse beaucoup pour pouvoir préciser exactement comment. Cependant, les deux points que j'ai donnés en réponse à votre collègue s'y appliquent. Nous avons toujours comparé les francophones de l'Ontario aux anglophones du Québec pour dire que nous ne jouissons pas de tous les droits et c'est encore un peu vrai, mais de moins en moins et nous continuons.

Le gouvernement actuel s'est déjà engagé — je pense spécifiquement à la question, par exemple, des collèges communautaires dans le nord et le sud de la province à titre d'un exemple — à continuer dans cette voie. S'il reste encore un écart, il est à se rétrécir et je pense que si, à titre de représentants du gouvernement et de la communauté francophone nous affichions clairement devant le Canada que c'est dans cette voie-là que comme province nous sommes engagés et que nous nous engageons à poursuivre, ça peut être un exemple, ça devrait pouvoir se faire donc à la grandeur du pays. Il faudrait bien réfléchir aux mécanismes pour le faire efficacement.

M. Bisson : Je suis d'accord avec vous que la plupart dans le pays sont pas mal tolérants. Comment peut-on démontrer au Québec qu'il y a de l'accord au pays, de la tolérance envers nos confrères au Québec ? Qu'est-ce qu'on a besoin de faire ici en Ontario pour leur faire savoir que oui, on veut écouter, on veut négocier ?

M. Mongenais : Je pense deux choses, Monsieur Bisson. D'abord, le dire clairement comme gouvernement, il va sans dire, parce que c'est quand même le gouvernement qui parle en notre nom. Mais malheureusement, au Québec ce sont les petits événements — je les appelle petits; c'est peut-être symbolique, ça représente les petits esprits, d'ailleurs — ce sont quelques incidents contraires à cet esprit qui ont continuellement fait les manchettes, et ça se comprend parce que c'est toujours ce qui va mal qui fait plus la manchette ; on ne parle pas tellement de ce qui va bien.

La deuxième chose qui serait nécessaire c'est que justement de la population en général s'élève ce cri, cet engagement. Il faudrait que la commission encourage toutes les sociétés privées — je ne dis pas commerciales — les groupes, les groupements, les associations provinciales et

régionales, les individus de langue anglaise surtout, de l'exprimer pour que le message passe que ce n'est pas simplement un vœu pieux exprimé par le gouvernement mais que ça représente vraiment la volonté du peuple.

C'est regrettable, peut-être, mais je pense à l'exemple du fameux piétinement du drapeau dans une ville ontarienne qu'on a affiché partout pendant je ne sais pas combien de semaines et qui représentait très peu d'efforts de la part des gens qui l'ont fait et ensuite, qu'un certain nombre d'anglophones de cette communauté, à leur propre frais, si je ne fais pas d'erreur, et donc en donnant beaucoup plus d'eux-mêmes, au coût de beaucoup plus d'efforts et d'argent, se sont rendus au Québec pour faire le geste de s'excuser. Mais je soupçonne que 90% des Québécois ne le savent même pas et c'est le premier. C'est pour ça que c'est très difficile à faire, évidemment, mais il doit y avoir des moyens de le faire au moins aussi bien que possible que des individus. Quand la ville de Sault-Sainte-Marie s'est déclarée unilingue, un certain nombre de conseils d'autres villes se sont très vite hâtés pour exprimer le point contraire. C'est ce genre de choses qui devraient être multipliés, à mon avis.

COMMITTEE OF NATIVE JUSTICE

The Chair: I call Doug Pine, from the Committee of Native Justice.

Mr Pine: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. In your discussion paper, you ask two questions: First, how can the right of aboriginal peoples to manage their own affairs be most effectively related to Canadian society? Second: What approach should be followed to ensure that the needs of aboriginal peoples in Ontario and Canada are addressed effectively?

The answers can be given in two words: self-government.

From our perspective, we must work from the premise that self-government means that aboriginal people have absolute control over their lands, resources and people. First nations and tribal councils must have the exclusive and final authority to make and enforce laws within their own territory, to control and manage the development of their lands and resources, to administer and control the monetary affairs of their territory and to determine first nations citizenship and membership.

1600

The Indian Act has effectively extinguished these rights, leaving only a delegation of limited powers. The effect of the act has been to diminish the roles of the chief and council from being effective decision-makers to that of mere administrators. Traditionally, the powers of the chief and council came from the people and did not originate from a piece of legislation such as the Indian Act. Aboriginal people have always taken a communal approach to their social, political and legal affairs. For example, if a decision needed to be made regarding land management, the issue would be brought before the community as a whole and everyone had the opportunity for input and participation in any resolution. The chief and council would then enforce or administer this decision.

The democratic system put in place by the Indian Act has eroded our process of community participation and

decision-making, undermining it as inefficient. I would like to draw to your attention that the very process you are engaging in by holding these discussions is in fact the very method of communal participation that I have been talking about. You will agree with me that this process is both lengthy and time-consuming. However, it does provide for direct participation by your constituents in the governmental process. On a smaller scale, this process is still the most effective means of decision-making for our communities. Our communities, unlike yours, are comprised of, for the most part, large extended-family units, therefore making the election process as set out in the Indian Act undemocratic.

There appears to be a perception within the Canadian society that aboriginal self-government is a brand-new idea. We would like to stress that the capacity to be self-governing has never been a right relinquished by our people. Canadian society as we know it is comprised of various ethnic groups. This society has not established a common unity, nor does it share a common identity beyond the land which is occupied. The creation of the Indian Act has been to impose upon us assimilation policies in an attempt to integrate us into Canadian society. I would like to ask you this: How can you ask us to adopt a Canadian identity which does not exist nor which is acceptable by all Canadians?

I do not want to belabour these points, because they have all been said before. I would, however, like to say that three very important tasks must be accomplished with the province in order to facilitate negotiations between the federal government and the first nations. These are the acceptance by this province of aboriginal rights which flow from the treaties, for the province to acknowledge the existence of land claims which inherently belong to native people and for the province to work alongside the aboriginal people in their struggle to re-establish their traditional forms of self-government.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I do not believe that by an adoption of self-government, as I have outlined it, the settlement of land claims or the recognition of treaty rights poses a threat to Canadian sovereignty, but would enhance it.

Mr Winniger: One thing we have learned on our travels is how much we have to learn from native culture and values. You mentioned the model of communal decision-making, which has been suppressed for so long under the Indian Act. What I am wondering is whether that kind of communal decision-making has any implications for us; whether in terms of resolving some of our national issues and building a new form of Confederation; whether you, with your background in communal decision-making and consensus, have anything that you can tell us that would avail us in consensus-building.

Mr Pine: It is not a question of whether we are here, first of all, to interpret to you the decision-making process of our people, even though it may enhance the growth of this country. When our people in the past had made a decision based on the collective with regard to land treaties, it has always been one that has been made through a process of consensus. We would get together as a people,

we would get together as a community and approach a question from the aspect of where it stands within our community. It would be put forward to the community members, who in turn would discuss it. At that time, once a consensus had been reached, then it in turn would be delivered to the chief and council for any administration of that particular decision or enforcement of it. It is a long process, but one which has helped native people in this country to survive.

One prime example of that decision took place this summer in Oka, the decision of negotiations. There was a question brought out, why there were so many people involved in the negotiations between the Mohawk nations, their negotiators, and the federal government and the Quebec government. You must understand that within the long-house form of government within the Iroquoian society, the only decision they are able to make is one of a collective. We cannot have a delegation of authority acting on our behalf without our direction. So when the question of whether those 17 or 30 people who were involved with the negotiation seemed inappropriate, it must be recognized that we as nations do have a very strong dependence on our communal decisions in order to forge ahead.

Mr Beer: In your third recommendation you asked for the province to work alongside the aboriginal people in their struggle to re-establish their traditional forms of self-government. What kinds of things are you thinking the province could do with the aboriginal people in bringing about self-government? Were there some specific things you had in mind?

Mr Pine: Not specific things, but it is our belief that any negotiation or relationship that exists must exist between the federal government and all our representatives from our first nations people, that those negotiations be conducted between those two parties because the federal government represents the views of Canadian people and our first nations represent the views of our people.

When we look at what we are asking the provinces, to facilitate the ongoing consultation that needs to take place between the federal government and these first nations in regard to land claims, we need to have a body to facilitate the negotiations whereby our treaties are affected. We need the province to involve itself to facilitate the kinds of ongoing conversation that is needed in order to develop self-government.

In the past, the federal government and the provinces have detoured away from allowing the communities in first nations to actually participate in any decisions. It is important for the province to realize that in order to bring about self-government, the people from the first nations must be given access to the kinds of areas that are required in order to develop that form of government.

1610

Mrs MacKinnon: Mr Pine, you state here: "The powers of chief and council came from the people and did not originate from a piece of legislation such as the Indian Act." Would you care to explain that, please? I always thought it came from the Indian Act.

Mr Pine: No, the Indian Act was brought about by the federal government in 1951. It is my understanding that the act was brought about to administer the affairs of native people within this country.

The powers of the chief and council prior to that were greater to the extent that they represented the views of their people. Until as recently as 1965, 1966, 1967, when the federal government negotiated on behalf of the Canadian people, it negotiated with the communities directly with regard to the kinds of areas that needed to be addressed within Indian communities.

The act nullified that. The act restricts—and I have taken this from a paper from the area I am from. I have a bit of a hard time pronouncing the name, but just to give you some examples, a band cannot sell, lease or dispose of land to a non-band member without government consent. A surrender of land is required; bands cannot dispose of resources such as timber, minerals, oil and gas without the minister's consent, and again a surrender is usually required; reserve lands cannot be used as security for loans to support economic development; the minister may direct the use of reserve lands for purposes such as education facilities, roads, agriculture.

These are restrictions which have been placed upon the chief and council in their capacity to make decisions on behalf of their people. I could go on and on in explaining the restricted capacity that the chief and council have had to deal with since the implementation of the Indian Act.

Mrs MacKinnon: No, you have done very well. Thank you very much.

ANN ILIJANIC

The Chair: I call Ann Ilijanic, from the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County.

Ms Ilijanic: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am glad you arrived here in Windsor safely, if slightly delayed.

The Chair: Excuse me. Before you actually start I would just like to announce that in fact our interpreters also have arrived. You just reminded me by what you said, so we are at full steam as far as the interpreting facilities are concerned, being able to have translation back, interpreting back and forth from English to French and French to English.

Ms Ilijanic: Thank you. My name is Ann Ilijanic and I am here today on behalf of the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County.

The origin of the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County is one of grass-roots community commitment. In 1971, with the inception of the federal policy of multiculturalism, some 30 ethnic cultural groups in the southwestern region came together to put multiculturalism into practice.

Collectively these groups decided to amalgamate with the Citizenship Council of Greater Windsor and the Essex County All Nations Association to form what is known today as the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County. The nature of the modern organization remains true to its community roots. The council is an umbrella

agency of more than 90 different ethnocultural groups, organizations and affiliations.

The mission of the council is to create a harmonious multicultural society in Windsor and Essex County. As an umbrella organization of community-based groups involved in folk arts promotion, intercultural education, newcomer integration, cultural retention and race relations promotion, the council envisions the creation of a harmonious multicultural society as being achieved through three principal means: partnership between governments and the private sectors and between individuals and groups; the promotion of the acceptance of and appreciation for the coexistence of various cultures; and the elimination of all forms of discrimination.

The community is committed to playing a proactive leadership role in supporting its membership through organizational development, community networking, inter-agency co-ordination, direct service delivery and advocacy.

This is the background and perspective from which I am addressing this committee today. Membership in the council is inclusive of all walks of life, all racial, ethnic and cultural groups represented in this area.

I shall try to keep my presentation today consistent with and sequentially relatable to the public discussion paper issued by the government of Ontario. In light of this let me begin.

"What are the values we share as Canadians?" It might be said that in the past Canada was held together in part by the perceived needs of its component parts and in part by the sociopolitical inertia of its colonial legacy. The fact that today regions of this country are openly speaking of separation, sovereignty and greater input into the decision-making process attests to the success of the country in nurturing and strengthening its various parts.

The fact that the old order which has benefited so many of us for so long is being questioned also means that we can no longer take for granted the continued viability of our course. To remain strong today we must turn to the values which all Ontarians and Canadians hold dear. I am speaking of our most cherished attributes and rights that perhaps newcomers to this country can more clearly appreciate than those who have known no other way of life.

The priceless and irreplaceable personal freedoms—freedom of expression, freedom of choice, of religion and all other aspects of that freedom—are surely valued commonly among all of us. So too is our great tradition of peaceful democratic change and government. Fundamental to both of these concepts is the underlying appreciation of and respect for each other as individuals, groups and regions.

These elemental values are what the council sees our country and province sharing irrespective of region, province, language or background. It is with these that we can change, build and grow. It seems almost redundant to say this, but Canada now faces a time of change and change is often painful. We cannot completely abandon our past, nor can we ignore the changing character of this country.

It is not a time for further internal cleavages. There is no room for separation in a successful modern society.

Collectively we will always be stronger and we must pull together for an honest and frank discussion of our shared needs and concerns; to rewrite the rules so that everyone can play the same game equally and for his own benefit, because in the end no system, no relationship, no partnership will last or truly benefit its members if it is not perceived as equal, fair and just to one and all alike.

1620

Specific questions must be answered about the appropriateness of a proclamation of a Charter of Rights and Freedoms for all citizens in one breath and a notwithstanding clause allowing for overriding those rights and freedoms in the next. Does Ontario believe in guaranteed rights and freedoms for all its citizens or not? The council thinks it should.

"How can we secure our future in the international economy?" Multiculturalism, in view of the international nature of modern trade and economics, is beneficial to the future of this province. It is enlightened policy that recognizes and reflects the province's greatest resource, its people.

In the current jargon of economic thinking, terms like "free trade," "common markets," "enhanced trade," "economic union," are all the rage. It concerns us that in the rush to secure markets, be more competitive and balance budgets, the purpose of economic wellbeing is sometimes forgotten: namely, that economies exist to benefit the people; people do not exist to benefit the economy. The fundamental appreciation of the fact that an economy that is strong at the cost of the wellbeing of the population it serves is not something to be desired. No matter what economic choices we make as a province, it is of utmost importance to always bear in mind the social costs and benefits of those choices and weigh them very carefully.

"What roles should the federal and provincial governments play?" Our concern in this area relates back to the concept of fairness and equality. The state structure that we eventually settle upon must be one that has balance. The structure must strike an equilibrium that provides for both the protection of individual liberty and collective assurance.

Individuals and communities must feel that they can lead lives that provide them with reasonable opportunity to reach their goals and fulfil their aspirations. Without such a balance, without the existence of government that provides a framework that is inclusive of these human needs, then our efforts here today and the energy spent on dealing with Ontario's place in Confederation will be wasted. The result will be that no harmony will exist in our country and that we will have only managed to delay the inevitable breakdown of our country.

"How do we achieve justice for Canada's aboriginal people?" It is most appropriate that the sad history and present state of Canada's original peoples be addressed in any discussion on this province's and this country's future. Whether it was a deliberate conspiracy or simply gross insensitivity that our society degraded and undermined and marginalized native culture is a point on which agreement may never be reached.

What we as Ontarians and as Canadians must address ourselves to is the question, "If we are now demanding a system that is more just and fair to the different regions,

groups and provinces, how can we deny the native peoples their own piece in the just society?" Natives have been forced to live in a paternalistic and humiliating fashion, subjected to segregated governmental treatment. No other population in this country is treated like human chattel in the same fashion that native peoples have been. Dependence on government stipends, grants and largess must be ended. The time has long since come to enfranchise the original people of this land, to let them live in their independent, self-reliant manner all other citizens share as a birth or naturalization right.

This means the granting of some form of self-government, perhaps along the lines of municipalities, along with sufficient means to empower each band, tribe and nation to achieve success for itself. No single solution exists to fit all the different claims that are there, but surely if our system would not just listen but actually hear what is being said to it by many articulate native leaders, real solutions can be found.

"What is the role of the English and French languages in Canada?" Ladies and gentlemen, no other question in this discussion paper is harder for a multicultural council to deal with than this. As an umbrella group of communities that speak all the major languages of the world, we are familiar with some very heartfelt feelings on this subject.

Our experience with our various groups teaches us that one should distil the cause of such strong emotions down to two basic elements. These elements appear to be perception and insecurity. When people perceive that an inequality of treatment exists, based on the linguistic and cultural background of an individual or group, then the result is inevitably bitterness, tension and passionate emotion.

Insecurity often results or accompanies such perceptions of inequality. When people feel insecure, threatened or vulnerable as a result of linguistic characteristics, this all too often manifests itself in negative and destructive fashions. That is why laws relating to something as fundamental as language must be equally legislated and implemented throughout the state. It seems impossible to imagine a situation in which linguistic duality can co-exist in harmony where perceptions of inequality and insecurity are also found.

Examples can be seen in Ontario's Bill 8 and Quebec's Bill 178. Ontario's Bill 8 promotes the use of the French language throughout regions of the province for its 5.4% francophone minority. In Quebec Bill 178 limits the use of the English language by its 8.8% anglophone minority. The inequity of these two pieces of legislation results in resentment and tension between groups which have previously lived in relative peace.

There is also another point the council feels must be recognized. That is that in Canada generally and in Ontario particularly one can no longer say that society is bilingual, bicultural or binational. The fact of modern society is that we live in a multilingual, multicultural and multinational community. This must be kept in mind when dealing with questions of language and our laws must reflect this reality.

"What is Quebec's future in Canada?" It is the belief of the Multicultural Council of Windsor and Essex County that in a discussion paper dealing with Ontario in Confederation

and in a presentation addressing Ontario's aspirations and interests in this country's future, it is strange that comments should be solicited on Quebec's interests and role.

I think it can be said with justification that Quebec does a more than adequate job articulating its own position. Ontario can best address questions and negotiations with Quebec, the federal government and the other provinces once it has achieved a comparable degree of clarity and resolve in expressing what its own interests are.

However, as comment has been solicited, the council would like to say that a simple recognition of Quebec's distinctiveness would probably not be in the best interests of Ontario. No one denies the unique character of the province of Quebec, but Canada is made up of numerous distinct societies. To only recognize the distinctiveness of one province, region or group is to do injustice to all others. To recognize Quebec as distinct would be to imply that the rest of the country was homogenous.

The concept of Canada plus Quebec is too simplistic and would certainly lead to the perception of inequity and feeling of insecurity alluded to earlier in this presentation. Canada would not be the country it is today had Quebec not been the active participant in our historical evolution that it has been. The policy of multiculturalism itself is attributed to Canadian compromise, resulting from Prime Minister Trudeau's policy of official bilingualism, as an appeasement to those of neither French nor English origin. Without Quebec, it is quite conceivable that multiculturalism itself would not exist in Canada today. Quebec along with all other regions, peoples and provinces make up Canada.

"What is the place of the west, the north and the Atlantic region?" Once again the council can only say it feels that Ontario must define its position and not attempt to define or address other regions' concerns for them. It is not our place to articulate what might be acceptable for and to the other provinces. Ontario must be confident in knowing its own interests and aspirations and negotiate with goodwill and an open mind from there.

"What does Ontario want?" The council believes, as you can see throughout our brief, that Ontario will be best served by a Canada that is open and equitable. All partners in Confederation must be comfortable with the constitutional and other arrangements within the country. Free flows of people, goods and services and ideas should be maintained.

Our society and institutions must recognize our past, but not at the expense of here and now. Recognition must be given to the diversity of Ontario's society and the people it comprises. Individual rights and freedoms must be ensured, but not at the expense of any group or community. Without a feeling that the country treats its citizens with equity and fairness, then no lasting balance can be struck. Harmony and balance benefit all citizens and this must be recognized in the negotiating process.

In conclusion, and recognizing that this commission was instituted as a response to Quebec's unilateral constitutional demands, we respect that if the people of Quebec choose sovereignty for their province, they should be free to follow that route. However the divorce of the country

will be a very expensive and regrettable proposition for both partners.

1630

The Chair: There is a bit of time but I would caution the members that we need to be brief in our questions in order to get through.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you very much for answering the document. We have not had a lot of people do that in such a systematic way. I wonder if you would say a little bit more to me about what you answered on question 5 when you said: "The fact of modern society is that we live in a multilingual, multicultural and multinational community. This must be kept in mind when dealing with questions of language and our laws must reflect this reality." Could you say a little bit more about what that means at this crucial time of decision-making for this province and maybe beyond its borders?

Ms Iljancic: I believe the conversation within the council—and I must say that I have consulted with our council and our board members extensively on this issue—is to answer the perceived inequality which Bill 8 in Ontario insists on and also the reflection of Bill 178 in Quebec which limits the use of language.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Do you have a manner in which you or the 30 groups that are together do some of the things that Bill 8 does for your communities?

Ms Iljancic: Ninety groups.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Sorry. Do you have a volunteer organization or how do you serve people, for instance in health services or in educational services, who are at a disadvantage at least in the beginning with language?

Ms Iljancic: With the language? We have many groups. We offer translation and interpretation services. We offer them on a professional basis, but for anyone coming to this province or to this country not speaking the languages of French or English, we offer them translation services. As far as health services are concerned, we refer them to the appropriate bodies.

Ms Churley: On question 5, you mentioned the two different bills. I just wanted to ask you if you are aware that one of the differences between the minority English in Quebec and the minority French in Ontario is that for many years now the government of Quebec has of course allowed the English to run their own schools, run their own universities, run their own businesses, and do basically everything in English whereas we have not had the reverse for francophones in Ontario, and if you see that as part of the imbalance.

Ms Iljancic: Yes, that is part of an imbalance and we are aware of that. But I think if you will look back to any of these issues that the council has discussed and touched upon, there is the fact that people perceive it as wrong. Sometimes perception becomes reality. There is the perception of these two bills by themselves and what happened subsequently in the media and the publicizing of this bill. There were some of the bitter feelings that occurred throughout Ontario, various cities, once this was

enacted. I believe in the discussion with our groups a lot of this was a backlash to no signs in English in Quebec.

VICTORIA BILLINGSLEY

The Chair: I call Victoria Billingsley.

Ms Billingsley: I am sorry I did not bring a copy for everyone.

The Chair: That is fine, if you just leave them with the clerk, we will get copies made.

Ms Billingsley: I have to apologize for the condition. I only knew a few days ago. Also there will be just a few inserts that are not on that copy.

The Chair: That is fine.

Ms Billingsley: Honourable commissioners, ladies and gentlemen, the word "Canadian" in this brief refers to all Canadians outside of Quebec except the francophones, who, like the Québécois, are insulted if one calls them Canadian. I am speaking on behalf of the silent majority who feel less Canadian today than they did 25 years ago, and many have told me that personally.

For the past 25 years, the federal government has failed dismally to establish equality of status for all Canadians. It has unilaterally given special status only to Quebec and to francophones. Quebec has federal powers over citizenship and immigration. It controls the federal pension plans. It has the right of veto and the right to opt out of federal programs. It has control of foreign trade and international competitive sports. It has the unilateral right to appoint one third of the Supreme Court judges. Federal laws and federally funded programs have no federal presence in Quebec. When Quebec speaks for Canada internationally, federal powers are eroded and Canada becomes a laughingstock.

Canada is now but an appendage of greater Quebec, which is practically a sovereign state within this pathetic Canada. How sweet it must be for all those separatists.

Quebec's grasp of power commenced when it gained the sweetest handmaiden of all, official bilingualism, which was but a camouflage in order to entrench French power in Ottawa and across the country, costing gullible Canadians \$4 billion a year. The prize federal powers are now in the hands of a fanatic Quebec separatist clique—and I could name them if you ask me—including Brian Mulroney, who do not give a damn about Canada.

Did our deaf, supine politicians call for Mulroney's impeachment when he uttered this insulting statement on 15 July 1989, "It is the French dimension of our national personality that constitutes the soul of Canada and its impact on the national and the international level." No, they did not. Neither did the groveling media, which failed to publicize it.

If Mulroney had taken the trouble to look at the Canadian war memorial at Vimy Ridge or if he had studied the Dieppe casualties he would have been hard pressed to find any French names. Canadians of all stripes, most important our native people, have given Canada its national and international impact.

Mulroney continues to speak with a forked tongue. Just last week he announced that he would be the great preserver of a strong federal government while at the same

time, that very week, Barbara McDougall was relinquishing federal power of immigration to Quebec and gave it the yearly funds of \$325 million, I believe, to administer it. Ironically, the same day, most press editorials praised the Prime Minister, the Windsor Star included, who closed the federal barn door after the prize federal horses were firmly in Quebec's hands.

To add shocking insult to injury, Serge Joyal, Secretary of State in 1982, admitted to a Nova Scotia group, "Everything we are doing is to make Canada a French state, a French country, both inside and outside Quebec...a country that reflects our French ideals."

How much clearer must the goals of Quebec be before naïve Canadians see the writing on the wall? It staggers the mind that Quebec has so completely hypnotized our quising politicians, our degenerate intellectuals, our deaf, malleable media, who grovel at its feet, terrified of ruffling any French feathers. A sad day indeed it is for Canadians when people are afraid to speak out. What a tragic farce Canada has become.

1640

All our MPs condoned Quebec's racist Bill 178. Not one objected. And Windsor's feudal politicians, Herb Gray, Steven Langdon and Howard McCurdy, refused to present to Parliament petitions against this bill. So much for democracy. It ends at the ballot box, my friends.

Quebec is absolutely distinct, believe me, by being the only province in Canada to pass racist language laws defying the Supreme Court. Quebec has the distinct distinction of being the only province in Canada where one cannot conduct one's business in the language of one's choice. On 19 March 1989 Bourassa waxed enthusiastically: "Never in the history of Quebec has a government suspended fundamental liberties to protect the French language and culture. For the first time since 1759, English lost its official status in Quebec and it was I, Robert Bourassa, and my government who did it!" Bravo for Robert Bourassa.

At last the worms have crawled out of the woodwork. Who can doubt that French culture is contingent on the suppression and destruction of the Canadian language and of Canada's British heritage? Bourassa allows only three Canadian flags to fly in Quebec, and when we do see our flag there it is being burned, torn, trampled or spat on.

Recently, Bill C-72, which Canadians know nothing about, has quietly killed official bilingualism. Desjardin and D'Iberville Fortier announced the new policy: linguistic duality. It is no longer official bilingualism. It is linguistic duality, my friends, with French and English now having equal status.

On 16 May and 23 May 1990 the meetings of the joint Senate and the House of Commons were conducted totally in French. Linguistic duality, as it becomes entrenched, will discriminate against Canadians even more than official bilingualism did, and it will destroy Canada as we so proudly knew it 25 years ago.

We give Governor General's awards to Quebec authors who vilify Canadians. Beauchemin, the most popular of these, writes: "Two cultures cannot blossom in the same linguistic space. Bilingualism exercises a devastating effect on our collective conscience; it undermines our confidence

in ourselves and it shrivels our souls." This quote speaks for itself. It needs no further comment, except to reveal to us why Quebec declared itself unilingually French.

On 29 January 1986 copies of the following quotation from *Le Rempart*—by the way, the editor just spoke here: Mongenais—were sent to all the major newspapers in Canada and to Maclean's. Not one dared publish it. I read the quote and I translated it: "A minority, well-organized"—and, of course, with public funds—"with aims and objectives, can dominate a majority who are apathetic and uncaring. We, the French, are a very proud race who must strive for this goal of dominance."

The Chair: If you could sum up, please, you are at the end of the time.

Ms Billingsley: I just have one more page, okay?

The Chair: At the rate you are going, you are going to need much longer to finish, so if you could sum up, please.

Ms Billingsley: You were very liberal with the others.

The Chair: I have been trying to do my best to keep people to the time allotted.

Interjections.

The Chair: You are welcome to take a couple of minutes to sum up.

Ms Billingsley: Okay. I will try to finish it up.

Anyway, the thing is now a fait accompli. French power is in French hands in Ottawa. Charles Beer, who, by the way, is here, has admitted to creating another Quebec in Ontario within 10 years with the power of Bill 8. I hear this on French television every morning.

We have had enough of linguistic and economic blackmail. It is time to say no to language policemen, federal and provincial, which no free country in the world would tolerate. They are called commissioners. It is time to repeal all language laws and to return to the wisdom of the founding fathers, who, in section 133 of the BNA Act, made French and English official languages only in the federal Parliament, the Quebec Legislature, the federal courts and the Quebec courts and nowhere else. Quebec is no more distinct for speaking French than the rest of Canada is for speaking English or whatever. Remove the language and we are all human beings who love, hate, eat, steal, kill, procreate, sing, dance, weep and struggle to survive. The only distinction is that the French want to rule Canada and they have pretty well succeeded.

It is time to stop paying for our own demise. It is time for Canadians to be governed in one official language, the language of international communication and commerce, the language that most countries of the world are adopting, the language of the majority: English.

For Quebec to remain in Canada, it must be a province like all the others, with no special privileges or status. It can have its French, but it must not suppress other languages with racist laws, which must all be repealed if it is to remain a part of this country. Otherwise, the silent majority invites Quebec to separate and wishes it Godspeed.

The crucial war to be fought is not in the Persian Gulf, but here and now. Canadians must rise up with one voice

and fight for equality for all, special privileges for none. Canadians must kill for all time the insidious snake of official linguistic duality and Bill 8, not just scotch them. If this is not done, my friends, the fleur-de-lis will soon supplant the Canadian flag flying above our capital, Ottawa.

Unity will never be achieved as long as one province is more equal than the others. Unity at any price is unacceptable.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Billingsley. There are a number of points, obviously, that I am sure members of the committee would like to get into discussing with you, but time does not permit us to do that.

Mr Bisson: Mostly the facts, Mr Chairman.

The Chair: I think there are a couple of factual interpretations we might all disagree with, but none the less—

Ms Y. O'Neill: On a point of information, Mr Chairman: I do have to say that the Canadian flag flies in Quebec. From the front of my riding I can see at least 10 Canadian flags, and that is in one small corner of Quebec. I think that has to be said.

Ms Billingsley: On official buildings. Those are probably flown by—

The Chair: All right, Ms Billingsley. You have had your say. You obviously have strong views on some of these things, some of which we disagree with wholeheartedly, but you have the right to say that.

1650

MICHAEL HALL

The Chair: I call Michael Hall to come forward.

Mr Hall: My point of view will be much different from the previous person's. The funny thing is, we are all Canadian.

I am Michael Hall. I would like to thank all of you for coming to Windsor and also for giving me an opportunity to come here. My views about Canada are very strong, although I have tried to keep them toned down to a certain extent. Basically, I will just do as everyone else and I will try to read my speech pretty quickly.

The values we share as Canadians have increasingly been eroded by time. It is difficult to identify what are Canadian values, since we are being forced to meld into the American way of life more than we have ever had to before.

Canadians value equality of the human race. We do not like to distinguish between black and white, rich or poor. We do not like to separate black neighbourhoods and white or Chinese neighbourhoods. We want all of us to live together and share this same quality of life. Canadians value a non-violent society, where all citizens live in peace and harmony. Canadians do not want the right to carry Uzis and automatic rifles that can kill dozens in a single spray.

Canadians value their governments when they work to provide all Canadians—when I say "Canadians" I mean Ontarians, but Ontarians are Canadians first—an equal opportunity to share in Canada's economic wealth. We value our essential social programs, such as health care, education, workers' compensation and public works.

Canadians value their corporate citizens who portray what is uniquely Canadian. Canadians value openness to and tolerance of foreign peoples who come to share our country with us.

Canadians value their nation from sea to shining sea to shining sea.

We value our prime ministers when they stand up for Canada's rights on the world stage, be it to American ice-breakers plying our Arctic or to French fishing boats over-fishing our Atlantic coast.

How can Ontario and Canada compete in the international economy? To secure our future in the international economy Canadians must simultaneously be provided huge incentives to invest in corporations which sell to Canadians and Canadians must place more dependence on interprovincial trade than on international trade.

To counter free trade with both the United States and Mexico, ordinary Canadians must be given an easier way to buy into the companies that make huge profits from Canadians. Just giving us jobs is no longer enough. We must have a piece of the financial rewards to compensate for the jobs that will be lost.

Again, to counter free trade and strengthen Canada's real economy, Canadians must place more emphasis on interprovincial trade. Canadians must learn to rely on each other. There is less chance that a Canadian company will relocate south of the border when most of its business is done in Canada.

But to ensure success we must take down all interprovincial trade barriers, and concurrently with a strong domestic economy Canadians must build a strong international economy that is very much Canadian-owned. It is only by owning the manufacturers and producers of the goods and services we buy that we will assure our economic strength in the world market.

To take ownership of the Canadian and Ontario economies, I propose that the government of Ontario develop a system whereby sales taxes in the province are extended to cover everything, even more comprehensive than the GST. The sales taxes collected will go into a separate fund, something like Alberta's Heritage Savings Trust Fund, but the prime difference will be this: Every Ontarian will benefit because at the end of each year the sales taxes collected will be returned to the people. The only condition for its return to the people will be that Ontarians must purchase ownership in registered and bona fide corporations that do business in Ontario. After a few years, all Ontarians will own major portions of the companies that make their profits from Ontario wage earners.

What about our social programs? I feel some of them are absolutely necessary to equality of life for all Canadians—health care, education, workers' compensation and others. But the Ontario government has to stop pampering businesses and workers alike. Individuals, the young and the old, must learn to depend more on themselves for their wellbeing. Too many Ontarians take advantage of our state welfare system. We must weed out those who do not want to work.

We must discourage young people, especially single women, from starting families when they do not have the

financial means to look after their children. We must make injured workers realize that certain injuries do not automatically qualify them for lifetime benefits.

Our government must reduce spending in almost every field, but more important, it must determine where it is spending. Too many people in high places manage to milk our system just as much as those people who do not want to work for a living.

Our political system: The federal government should be paramount in the land, but there should be more equal representation for the other regions. I too can no longer tolerate the way Ontario and Quebec dominate the federal political scene. By all means, let's have an elected Senate.

Politically, Canada should adopt a political system which combines the best aspects of our present system and the American system. For starters, let's get rid of the monarchy. It is not a unifying factor and is nothing more than a remnant of British colonialism.

I am proud to be Canadian. I do not want to be American and I do not want to be British. Crown lawyers, royal commissions, Queen's Bench—these names are all hangers-on of a nation that, at best, views us as the 51st state. Canadians cannot identify with a monarchy that lives on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean and which has no bearing on our day-to-day lives.

Canada should also return to being a bilingual and bicultural state. We cannot afford to be something to everyone. Immigrants to Canada must be encouraged to adopt a Canada-first attitude. They must be taught Canadian values, culture, history so that they can more easily share in established Canadian values. All newcomers must be allowed to retain their language and culture, but they should be encouraged to integrate themselves into the Canadian community and quickly learn one or both of our official languages. The primary concern of every Canadian, new or native, should be the development of skills, language and culture that contributes to the economic and national wellbeing of Canadians.

Aboriginal Canadians: Canada's aboriginal peoples must be given the means to be financially self-sufficient. They must be allowed geographical areas to convert into provinces, which will be governed as such. By allowing aboriginals the right to create provinces, we give them the right to raise taxes, have their own schools and justice systems and elect members to the federal Parliament. If they decide they do not want any industry in their province, so be it, but the costs will have to be borne by themselves. There must always be a right to freedom of movement of people and goods in any new province created. Under no circumstance do I believe that any aboriginal group should be allowed sovereignty. Canada must remain united under one roof.

French in Canada: The issue of language is my next point. Canada was born with two languages, French and English. We were colonized by two great nations, France and England. Those two countries fought over us and, in the end, England won the war. But England, even back in the 17th century, realized how strong the French presence was in Lower Canada and allowed French to prosper and flourish.

I want to say this next point ever so strongly. No political party or movement in Canada is going to get away with French-bashing any more. I am talking specifically about the Reform Party, the Alliance for the Preservation of English in Canada and all those itty-bitty city councils in Ontario which declared themselves unilingual English.

I am appalled at all those bigoted, fearmongering racists. I liken them to the Ku Klux Klan, inciting hatred of my fellow citizens just because they are French Canadian. To all of you, I say you will never succeed in making them second-class citizens, not even if you succeed in tearing this great northern country apart and forcing Quebec to leave its Canadian family.

Franco-Canadians live mainly in Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick. Geographically, they cover half our land mass. Some people will say that there are more Italians or Ukrainians in certain areas and that they, or other groups like them, should also have equal status.

Equal status to whom? To French? To English? Are we to have a multinational nation? I hope not. Two official languages, as we see, are more than enough. Our immigrants have done a lot for Canada, but they did not create Canada. The French and English living in Lower and Upper Canada, created Canada, but as Canadians we cannot demand a united country when at the same time we deny our own flesh and blood, other Canadians, French-speaking ones, from St-Boniface, Windsor, Sudbury, Rimouski, Montreal and so on. They have an inalienable right to speak and be served in French so long as Canada is one nation. But if we are to have one nation, we cannot force our French brothers and sisters to live in Quebec and not feel at home in the rest of Canada.

1700

To the French-bashers, again I say, stop lying to the people of this great nation and this province. There is no threat to the English language in Canada, not even in Quebec is there a threat. There is a threat, however, to our country because you, the extremists, have forced Quebecers into believing English Canadians are all the same and will not help them preserve their language. To the French-bashers I say, learn French. You will be surprised at how quickly you can do it—four years maximum if you put your heart into it—and it will open up your minds like never before. The next time you want to put down the French language, sing Canada's national anthem in French first.

I hope there are enough people in this province who will stand up and say proudly to Quebecers and French Canadians everywhere, "We honestly love you." Yes, love; that is what real nations are made of. We must make French Canadians believe, before it is too late, that their language is our language and that we can help them protect it. When French Canadians see that their language is safe throughout Canada, they too will feel safe in Canada and it will not matter how the provinces and federal government cut up their jurisdictions.

I seek the support of all of you in asking the provincial government to declare Ontario officially Canadian and bilingual. Ontario can and should take the lead in rebuilding a new Canada based on love for all of its citizens.

Thank you. Merci.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Hall. You have gone slightly over time and we are going to have to move on to the next speaker. We will not have time for questions.

JOHN MEYER

The Chair: John Meyer.

Mr Meyer: I expect that committee members are now well aware of the variable weather conditions and the distances within this large province of Ontario. I am reminded of the respondent on the 800 number who asked me when I phoned about two weeks ago: "Where are you calling from? Where is Windsor? What large city is it near?" Truly. He then proceeded to ask his colleague to find Windsor on the computer screen. I am not sure whether this says much about the educational system in Ontario or the part-time hires the committee may have hired to answer that 800 number, but I was rather shocked. So I told him, "Look for Chatham or look for Leamington."

As a reasonably informed and participating citizen and educator, I am continually impressed by the variety and the quality of the presentations I have been able to hear on cable TV, so I will not try to repeat what I have heard but rather supplement some of the excellent suggestions by essentially presenting my expectations of the government of Ontario.

1. I expect my provincial government to exercise new leadership in these very unsettled times. This might initially be done by continuing to create and implement policies that address current and future impending issues. Past history has a limited function to inform current practices, and I have been hearing a great deal of past history. Therefore, policy-makers must get on with a more proactive stance in more timely response to rapidly changing structures.

2. While I applaud the Ontario government's concern about consultation and community-building, it must not become an end in itself so that the very process becomes an obstacle to change. There must be a greater attempt to close the gaps between the new realities and existing structures and legislation. Relatively stable priorities should be established and then urgent implementation take place. Absolute consensus is not more realistic than political tokenism, nor is it acceptable in my opinion. Government must begin to say no to some of the demands of special interest groups if they do not accommodate the priorities that I hope would be set and the economic restraints. A society cannot be all things to all people.

3. I expect government to recognize that our society can do with less unessential services, with less civil service, with less waste than is apparent very often in public bureaucracies. I would expect government to reorganize, with a perspective of cost-effectiveness and essential services. It may be that sufficient maturation has occurred in this province in various sectors to call for the actual elimination of certain structures that were established years ago for quite other purposes or for purposes which have long ago been achieved. We have a highly fragmented public sector, with even various ministries competing for vast budgets and sometimes working at odds with one another. For example, we should be concerned about the total welfare

of the child, the young person, the adolescent, which may in fact involve three ministries at least, in education, social services and correctional services. Presently, total care is fragmented and often unable to respond to the needs of the one individual for various reasons, and this also applies to the inner section of federal and provincial agencies. We need clarification and avoidance of duplication of these services.

4. I expect this government, in its quest for change for the better, to restore authority to all those sectors which have devolved into licence to do whatever one can get away with. If citizens fail to exercise their responsibilities, they should suffer the consequences for harming society and community.

Why is not our legal system responsive to the plight, for instance, recently in Windsor, of the infant who was murdered and thrown into the river, largely because the adolescent father was under the influence of alcohol and drugs? The sentence has now been rendered that the adolescent will receive 10 years' imprisonment, but possibly be paroled in three years, for killing an infant. I realize that this may be federal jurisdiction, but the province certainly can exercise leadership and accountability vis-à-vis federal law.

The irresponsible parent is sentenced then. So this is irresponsibility. Who accounts for this? Whatever is permitted and liable to abuse will find its takers at the expense of responsible citizens. Certainly the early democratic societies had far greater expectations of their citizens and of the contributions of their citizens, and they were punished far more severely than any of us can imagine if they harmed their local society and community.

In terms of our educational system, it is interesting that we only require anywhere from two to five weeks of exposure to citizenship in terms of government and law over a 12- to 13-year period of formal education. And then we wonder why our citizens are illiterate in terms of citizenship.

5. I expect this government to move with reflective haste in advocating the federal government to either consider a vast, centralization of powers or restructuring of government or new forms of affiliation that might respond to a sense of a North American community similar to the European Economic Community. This means that members of the Confederation should choose their commitments and expect to abide by equitable conditions.

Though I am personally convinced that nation-states as traditionally designed are no longer viable, I do advocate new alternatives for collaboration and co-operation and for sustaining quality of life. We currently operate as perhaps some 10 nations within this very loose Confederation, with a history of unfinished constitutional business.

6. I would expect the government to review the many costly and plural commissions and inquiries and committees—perhaps 800 to 1,000 currently exist—review their business, limited even to the last 20 years, which has touched on many of these issues. Determine the number of recommendations that they have elicited, which ones have been acted upon and which ones which have not been acted upon, and perhaps see if the ones that have not been acted upon are still feasible and do demand implementation.

1710

Let us stop reinventing the past, really to no significant avail. Look to those elements that are perceived to be divisive in our society, perhaps multiple systems of education, benefits for selected groups, perhaps bilingualism. It was recently suggested that perhaps Canada and the franco-lingual territories could be expected to consider a territorial jurisdiction such as Switzerland, where the language remains first in the territory but not outside of that territory,

The Chair: Mr Meyer, if you could sum up, please; you have gone beyond the time.

Mr Meyer: Yes. The taxation system that burdens the middle- and fixed-income earners is reflected in many of these demands. There are many areas of waste and accountable expenditures sometimes for the very wrong reasons.

Finally, I would expect that the government would introduce greater accountability, with expectations and standards at all levels of the public sector. Let's determine in what ways citizens should and are contributing to their society and in what ways they are not and why they are not.

W. D. LOWE SECONDARY SCHOOL

The Chair: Next, we have a group of students from W. D. Lowe Secondary School. We need, for the record, to get your names, if you want to do that at the beginning or as part of your presentation, as you prefer.

Mr Walsh: Good afternoon, Chairperson and members of the select committee. My name is Justin Walsh and I represent a panel of students from W. D. Lowe Secondary School. We are here to talk to you about the future of Ontario in Confederation. We have some common ideas, namely that Canada has been a successful country and that we want to remain united in the future. We also each have our own personal viewpoints about the future of Canada. Some areas that we will cover are the Constitution, multiculturalism, minority and native issues and equal rights.

Mr Smith: My name is Paul Smith and I am part of this panel and I will be speaking about equal rights and voting power. One of the major factors, I feel, that is ripping our cultural mosaic society apart like a great paper-shredding machine is the fact that power in this country is based upon the percentage your individual culture possesses, contrasted against others across Canada.

The natives of this land are only 1.7% of the total population, and we see and read in the news every day about what is happening to them. Equal rights among people today has become a very big issue and is one of importance, since it is our fundamental right to possess them no matter where we come from or how long we have been here. The reason equal rights has become such a big issue is simply because some of the people of Canada have not been able to exercise their rights. People have more rights than others.

Of over 26 million people in Canada, 67% are of either British or French origin, 2% of native origin and the other 31% are from other areas of the world. These statistics I just read to you are often used by politicians and many other peoples of this country as the basis for their stand on the issues. I say it as a sad statement, because it is simply

ludicrous to break down the Canadian people into their own little subsections or cultures, as originally we were all immigrants to this land, this land we have called Canada. Every single one of us, by tracing through our family tree and examining our roots, would find we originally come from another part of the world. This is a fact, and no matter how hard we try to escape it, we cannot, because it is the truth.

So do we base these percentages of power we hold on how long our individual cultures have been here and how much work our individual cultures have put forth for the development of this country? This cannot be used as a basis for a distribution of power, as it is simply unconstitutional. It goes against the statement that equal rights should be our fundamental right, as a person immigrating to Canada has not a long family line here in Canada and has therefore done less than others to develop our nation. I think the people of Canada would rather drop the idea that power should be based upon time rather than drop the Constitution.

When the Indians discovered Canada and later on the French and English rediscovered Canada, it became quite evident that there were going to be problems. It was here where the separation of cultures began, and it is quite evident, as Canada was separated into a French and English area. The English resided in Upper Canada and the French in Lower Canada. Today there is a shift in English favour when it comes to language and culture, but as a North American society, the English way of life is the majority. But we find it important to realize there are other languages and cultures.

Today, just to realize is not enough. These other minorities should receive an equal share with what happens in federal and their own respective provincial laws. Quebec feels it does not have this say and uses examples from the past where at times it truly did not have legal power. I am sure they endured great hardships, but not only was this over 100 years ago but there are other minority groups who today suffer the same.

Nothing has been learned and nothing changed in this country except percentage points, the French like to believe, yet the French language can be heard every day in every public school across the province being spoken by all walks of culture in the classrooms, from kindergarten to grade 8. The French language has also now become a compulsory course in the high schools. Yet this is not enough. The French have parliamentary power in our state and in their own province, in our backyards as well as theirs, and of course, the percentage of power they hold is based upon how many French people there are.

By these standards, if equal rights were to come into play then all other languages present in Canada, like Italian, Lebanese, Mexican, Japanese—the list goes on—should be taught in all schools across the province from kindergarten to 8 and one year in high school. They are not. I am not sure about other English-speaking people, but I realize that there are other cultures and races in this country of ours and that they should have the right to equal say about what happens in this country just as much as any other

person, including the French. But do the French realize this?

If we are to stay true to our Constitution and the fundamental rights that are present in our Constitution, then it is time for change. As a solution to the problems we are facing in the cultural mosaic which is known as Canada, I offer this: Why not take the ratio of the different cultures we have been using for so long against each other and give them equality by multiplying them into a common denominator so that each culture's ratio of voting power, when put side by side, equals the same number? This would further the power in each minority, in their say in not only who is elected to represent them in our Parliament but also further their powers in what bills are passed or rejected.

This proposal I offer to possibly be used in the Senate, where, instead of the Prime Minister taking in senators, the people of Canada, using the system, vote the senators into the Senate. This would truly give equality a chance in our country, whose basis just happens to be multiculturalism. Thank you.

1720

Mr West: Hello. My name is David West. Canada has prided itself on being a multicultural nation that welcomes many varied peoples and their ethnic cultures each year. Approximately 150,000 to 200,000 immigrants enter Canada each year. We believe that in order to fulfil an obligation when you take on being a multicultural nation, you should have certain programs to help get immigrants into the Canadian lifestyle while retaining their ethnic backgrounds. Also, minority access to justice: when people from different nations come to Canada and they need to go to court, it would be more helpful if you had certain programs to assist them while going to court, access to justice, as well as poor people and others.

Some of the other problems are on police treatment of minorities. With the growing number of minorities in the larger cities of Canada, police treatment has become a problem. Police now have too much to carry, they have too many duties to fulfil, and the training they get now, training on dealing with minorities—it is not sufficient just to take a three-day course to learn about it and then be expected to act on that every day, as well as having all your other problems of being a police officer to deal with. I believe you should start over from the training of the police in dealing with minorities. Evidence that prejudice still exists can be found in many cases, so they should also announce there is no place for people who are racists or bigots in the police system. Maybe that would discourage some.

In another area, Canada's native people, who have been talked about today, I personally believe it is bad enough when the white man pollutes his own lands, but when he comes to pollute native lands which were clean before the white man came, when you could just go out and drink the water and now you can no longer, when the fish are dying and this is one of the resources the natives live on, I do not believe this should be tolerated at all, in any way, shape or form. If the white man wants to pollute his newly acquired land, okay. But when it comes to native

lands I think there should be new laws erected to protect them. Thank you.

Mr Walsh: We are now going to talk to you about multiculturalism in Ontario. In Canada, we pride ourselves on creating a society in which people of different cultures can live together without sacrificing their freedom or individuality. It is just a hollow myth that Canada is a cultural mosaic and a country that celebrates much multiculturalism. The trouble is that we are incapable of consensus. Because many Canadians are so busy defending their rights, their bonds are slowly deteriorating.

Change is inevitable. The government will have to establish some commitments to make some important changes regarding our minorities. Our government will have to start looking at the options and review the possibilities that will strengthen our weakening nation. One possibility is education. If we educate our society about the vastness of our country and its impressive cultural and ethnic diversity, it may help to bring about a greater understanding and respect for minorities.

Ontario should take a strong stand and be the proud example for the rest of the country. We should start by bringing our communities together and eventually the entire province. This seems to be the only way to gain personal fulfilment and stability between the people of our nation. The greatest position this province could hold would be one where everyone has the willingness to coexist, develop a sense of belonging. I am not suggesting we move in the direction of the US and establish a melting pot, but rather we should move from self-exertion to a nation of co-operation.

In addition, we must look at what is holding our country together. Canada was a nation that was founded on these principles of peace and tolerance. These principles are deteriorating and the bonds breaking. We must learn to happily coexist. Our country will unite if we accept and develop the strength of diversity that is everywhere within our borders. We must remain as all but also as one, and remember that without each other we will never grow and prosper to our great extremes. Thank you.

Mr Nardini: Hello. My name is Derek Nardini, and I will talk to you about suggestions we make for the Constitution of Canada.

Since the 1982 constitutional amendments, we have seen many problems arise in Canada over language and rights. Our solutions to these problems are as follows.

First, we must remove any obstacles in our path to unity. The "notwithstanding" or "non-derogation" clause should be either adjusted not to include language and cultural rights or a better solution would be to remove it, therefore not allowing anyone to dissect our constitutional rights. This clause has created many problems. It was used by Quebec for Bill 178 to forbid the use of English on commercial signs and also by municipalities in Ontario and Quebec to become unilingual. This must not happen in a bilingual country. To aid in restricting this from happening in Ontario, we should follow the lead of New Brunswick by stating in the Constitution that the two official languages of Ontario are English and French. This would

not cause any problems to the English-speaking Canadians but it would help the French-speaking Canadians of this province.

Second, we now know that the federal government gave Quebec power over immigration. We agree that Quebec should receive a choice of immigrants entering Canada. This seems fair, but perhaps other provinces should also receive greater control over immigration.

Another unclear matter is the issue of interprovincial trade. We feel that if we have open trading with other countries, we should also have open trading with the provinces of our nation, as was the intention in 1867. We would have a more secure trade route with provinces of our nation rather than other countries.

In the Meech Lake accord, we were introduced to an idea by Quebec that federal money for provincial programs could be given to the province, which in turn would create its own compatible programs. If this idea were slightly changed so that the federal government would give the money plus a general program outline, which could either be changed slightly by the province, maintaining the federal program's general concerns but modifying it to suit the province, or a meeting of the ministers associated with the issue could be held which would deal with the concerns of the provinces and draft a national program that suits all the provinces, these ideas seem to work more efficiently than the long process of requesting changes in the program from the federal government.

Staying with the issue of Meech Lake, we should all be concerned with the Senate and the Supreme Court. We have seen that the Prime Minister can use his power over the Senate to force through laws and taxes which the majority of Canadians do not want or agree with. The Senate, in our view, should be representing the people. Therefore, we state that, first, the Senate should be evened off in a manner that still allows the large provinces to have power yet will give the smaller provinces more representation.

We also state that the Prime Minister not have the power to add senators who would aid his undesired policies. The senators would be divided into three forms of appointment: first, senators appointed by the province or territory; second, a number of senators equal to the territories who are appointed by a native national council; and third, a number of senators appointed by the Prime Minister for federal concerns. This Senate plan would give provincial, federal and native governments a voice in the Senate.

The Supreme Court is also a concern of ours. We feel the present division should be changed to include a representative for the natives of the country. This representative does not have to be a native, yet he would be elected by a native national council. These judges would be appointed by the cabinet, but from a list of nominees that the provinces and native council submit.

The question of Quebec and Canada's unity is not the only problem we should be concerned with. We also must deal with the native problems. Along with our prior suggestions, we also wish to request a native council, selected by native groups of the country, which is centred in Ottawa and acts as a form of provincial government for the natives of this country. Also, we would like the native affairs minister to

be selected by the federal government from a list of nominees which is created by the native council in Ottawa. This member would not have to be a native.

Finally, we wish to address the issue of a constitutional amending formula. This formula should be adjusted by changing the number of votes to pass any amendment from seven to nine. This would allow any two provinces to veto the changes. To go along with this, a ministers' meeting should be held once every two years to determine future considerations and the current problems of the country.

1730

Mr Walsh: I would first like to say that I am a proud Canadian. The young people you see in front of you are representative of some views of the future of Canada. We are the future of this great country. We will not sit idly by and allow politicians of this nation to break us apart. We are full of energy and are willing to fight.

As I listen to the older generation speak about the future of Canada, I realize some have given up. Many have submitted and become apathetic. They are sick and tired of Quebec's crying and the older generation just wants it out. But we have passion. We are not happy with the local figures pitting Quebec versus the rest of Canada. We are not happy with the English being pitted against the French or, in the education system, other religions versus the Roman Catholics.

We blame both the federal and provincial governments, past and present governments, especially the current Prime Minister, Brian Mulroney. If we are to stay together we must reorganize Canada. We must restructure. We must work all problems out and not roll the dice on any issues and come up with a quick-fix solution. French and Quebec rights must be addressed, but we cannot forget minority and native rights, and please do not forget the rest of Canada's rights.

We are willing to work out a deal to keep this beautiful nation together. I believe a strong central government has made this country easier to govern and has kept its citizens content. Thanks to welfare programs and universal health care, Canadian citizens are able to lead comfortable lives, but in a new nation we may have to give up some powers to Quebec and to other provinces such as Ontario, but we will be doing this in order to make us a stronger, unified nation. Any gains for Quebec must be gains for Ontario and every other province. We must keep the federal government as powerful as necessary to keep us united, but above all, let us remain united as we face the future. Thank you for allowing us to let our feelings be known.

The Chair: We are slightly beyond the time, but I think I will allow a quick question, if there are any. I just want to say, first of all, on behalf of the committee that we appreciate the presentation. From the young people we have heard so far, whether they are students in secondary schools or post-secondary schools or whether they are not students and working out in the work world, we have heard a number of interesting and useful suggestions to us. There is very clearly, as you said, a lot of thought that is

going on from the people who are the future of the country, and that is something we appreciate a great deal.

Mr Bisson: First of all, I feel somewhat happy knowing that our country is going to be in the hands of people who are somewhat enlightened on issues.

You touched on a number of points, but I just want to come back to one, because I think at the end of the day that is really the hurdle we have to get over. The problem we are in is that there is inflexibility on the part of the older generation, myself and others, who are inflexible when it comes to the issue, either French against English, bilingualism, yes or no, Quebec, yes they are out or whatever.

You spoke in your brief as that being sort of a frustrating feeling to have, to look at that, at the older people, "Why don't they understand?" What advice can you share with us as the older generation in making us understand that there are differences and that somehow we have to get together to try to solve some of our differences? What can you give us, any of you?

Mr Walsh: First of all, you should go to a public school such as W. D. Lowe. We have an ESL program; that is English as a second language. In a public education system, you meet people from all walks of life. You meet minorities, you meet people of every religion, of every social background. You should just walk through the halls one day, and not go to other places where everyone is suit and tie and stuff like that.

Mr Bisson: All right. Okay. I am starting.

Mr Smith: One other thing is to realize that you never stop learning, no matter how old you get, and when you see people, instead of running from your fear or whatever it is that is holding you back, just give it a chance, just for once or three times or five times until you understand, and then maybe you will be on your way to learning something different.

PAUL PAOLATTO

The Chair: I call Paul Paolatto. Mr Paolatto will be the final speaker for this afternoon and then we will take a break and come back for the evening list.

Mr Paolatto: Let me begin by congratulating the committee. I am just beginning to recognize the enormity of the task before you and if I might impose on you for another 10 minutes before your dinner break—probably well deserved—I hope I can offer something of some input or some value to yourself.

On the written presentation I have prepared, I will try to condense certain elements. I will pass some of the accolades, if I may, and get to the substance so we can expedite the process.

My intentions in speaking with you today are essentially fourfold. First, I would like to express my vision for a united Canada and its role as a member of our global community. Second, I wish to identify and endorse a policy framework which I feel is critical to the realization of this vision. Third, I would like to offer suggestions as to an improved process for both determining and implementing future public policy in our country. Finally, I would like to comment, if I may, on Ontario's role in Confederation.

To begin, my vision for Canada is a country which guards the rights and freedoms of its individuals, embraces its united heritage, acts as an agent of opportunity and remains a strong partner in the community of nations for the collective good and wellbeing of all its citizens.

While I recognize this statement somewhat oversimplifies the definition of our country, please permit me an opportunity to elaborate.

In my opinion, if the goal of our country is to continually enhance the quality of life of its people, it follows that Canada at minimum must ascribe to the following four positions.

First, I agree with the existing view of our country as a guardian of individual rights and freedoms. Such stewardship is fundamental to the continued functioning of a democratic society. However, with these rights comes responsibility, and where the rights of individuals come in conflict with one another, the collective rights of society must take precedence in resolving the dispute.

Second, I believe Canada's heritage extends beyond the traditional founding nations view of this country. We must recognize that several cultures from around the world contributed to its development. As such, our Confederation must reflect this heterogeneous makeup.

Third, I strongly advocate a country which directs its financial and human capital to the creation of opportunity for all its citizens. Only through opportunity will people resist the mere subsistence afforded them through our support programs and assume greater responsibility for their own welfare and that of our society.

Finally, I endorse our evolution from a fringe player on the international scene to one of executing quiet, confident leadership in helping shape international policy. However, as political, cultural and economic barriers continue to fall around the world, we must continually refine our policy and programs across all levels of government if we hope to remain an influential member of this global community.

Now having articulated a vision for Canada and its people, I present for your consideration a policy framework which encompasses that vision. Please recognize that this framework is by no means absolute in design. It merely reflects those elements which I believe are critical to the realization of our country's quest.

As I mentioned, we must protect the rights of the individual, recognizing them as an equal partner in society without regard for race, religion, creed, social standing, sex or handicap. However, this framework should not further distinguish nor name specific members of society who should enjoy special consideration over anyone else. In my opinion, segmenting special interest groups only contributes to discrimination.

Now I recognize that certain indiscretions by the majority have disadvantaged the minority in the past. However, I firmly believe that as we have evolved as a society we have come to recognize the contribution of all its members. Further, I believe that this recognition is not the result of catch-up legislation, but rather is the product of increased awareness and mutual respect among societal members.

1740

If we legislate one equality for all people, we establish a level playing field upon which individuals who excel in life do so solely on the basis of merit and quality of being. We can then target and emphasize through public education the special interests that need to be addressed as we evolve. However, I am dead set against appending a laundry list of minority rights to our Constitution for the express purpose of affording special consideration over any other citizen.

The Constitution must also reflect the contributions of our heterogeneous membership to the building of our country. Therefore, I strongly support any reference and commitment to Canada's multicultural identity. It is the many cultural personalities which distinguish our country from any other nation in the world.

However, in order for society to prosper within a multicultural environment, we must dilute the current emphasis on the exclusive cultures of French and English. This dualist approach has neglected the cultural elements of society no more or less important than themselves. Moreover its implementation has been one of the major contributors to our country's political demise as it evokes special privileges to one segment of society over and above its other members solely on the basis of historical perspective.

I remain convinced that if Canada remains committed to a multicultural agenda, it must provide the same public services across all cultures. However, because this strategy completely ignores the huge economic cost associated with the delivery of such a program, then such services should be legislated only where they are warranted and economically justified.

I believe setting a public agenda which creates opportunity represents the greatest single contribution a government can make on behalf of its people. I believe maximizing one's potential is the means by which all members of society realize their self-worth. As such, it is imperative that society not merely care for disadvantaged members through social programs; we must direct our financial and human capital at creating opportunities for their continued advancement.

To this end I recommend we recommit ourselves to self-improvement. However, I do not suggest we merely throw more money at our education system. Rather I suggest we solicit participation from key economic interests like business, government and labour to design, develop and deliver a quality education program with particular emphasis on training in science and technology, research and development and the skilled trades. Moreover we should restructure our government programs to maximize societal participation and provide incentives to instill commitment.

Few would argue the importance of our export economy in contributing to our quality of life. However, as the world order continues to evolve at such a rapid pace it is becoming increasingly important that our country set policy which protects and/or enhances our competitiveness in world markets. This strategy requires Canada make a commitment to developing value added technologies in which

it currently enjoys or could enjoy a distinct competitive advantage.

I give examples of telecommunications, energy and transportation. It also reinforces the need for Canada to invest more in the development of human capital as well as the need to permit greater economic and social reward in order to protect that investment. While the latter point is contrary to our existing commitment to income redistribution and social support, it recognizes that the development of intellect, skills and innovation are investments which ultimately benefit all of society.

Just to reiterate, my presentation expresses a vision for Canada which supports equality across all individuals, embraces our heritage through multiculturalism, creates opportunities for personal and social advancement and advocates increased international competitiveness.

If I might now comment on your process, one of the critical questions before our nation is how to best facilitate public involvement and apply economic rationale in the setting of the future direction of this country.

It has become increasingly obvious that our government's capacity to satisfy the wants and needs of a number of divergent interests has become severely constrained. As such, we must begin to apply economic tests to our funding policies to determine if they are realizing their intended objectives and, more importantly, if the need for financial or public support is more pronounced in other areas.

Officials across all levels of government must begin to apply economic reality and not political expediency to the programs they chose to initiate. They must make choices with the collective good of all its citizens in mind, and they must introduce these initiatives with maximum public coverage, open debate and some measure of economic justification, such that it eradicates hidden agendas and maximizes public fund accountability.

If I might just provide a sidebar comment, in following some of the proceedings I have noticed one of the critical questions before many of the people who have presented before the committee is a concern of eliminating rhetoric. I firmly believe that what we need is to divest ourselves of words or phrases like "distinct society" or "asymmetrical federalism" and, if we decide to use those types of labels, that we quantify or qualify what implicitly that involves. I think one of the critical things in doing so is it eliminates confusion. I say this tongue in cheek, but when a politician says to me "Trust me," you can imagine I have some reservations.

The Chair: Mr Paolatto, if you could sum up, we are already out of time.

Mr Paolatto: I will, sir. I would advocate the introduction of such policies as the rights of recall and referendum. The right of recall helps entrench public accountability as it provides people with a vehicle to recall elected officials who might work contrary to the public good. Similarly, a referendum provides the public with an opportunity for input on a specific issue of specific importance to the general populace.

I think the critical point, if I may make any contribution, I finally endorse the use of a collaborative process as

outlined earlier as a means of determining future policy direction. This process secures input from the very people who must live with policy decisions. Collaboration would prove particularly helpful in the areas of education and international strategy-setting.

If I might just briefly comment on Ontario's role, very quickly, as the economic hub of Canada, I would hope that Ontario assumes a leadership role in advocating many of the policy positions I have presented here today. I would hope the province actively endorses and participates in Canada's reunification.

However, I strongly recommend that Ontario avoid a fire sale strategy by blindly consenting to the demands of any province. I would urge the government of Ontario to proceed with extreme caution in setting a policy of official bilingualism for the province, especially in light of the volatile political environment confronting our nation. I do not disagree with the political issue of bilingualism; I just merely think we should exercise caution until such time as this volatile situation is eradicated.

Finally, I would hope Ontario would prepare an alternative strategy for Canada should Quebec choose to fulfil its own destiny. The government of Ontario must be prepared to demonstrate a willingness to work with Quebec in achieving its aspirations and set a platform for a new, interdependent relationship with that country. While few people in Ontario would welcome such a radical departure from the traditional view of Canada, it would present us with an opportunity to reaffirm our own evolution as a nation.

Thank you again for your time and consideration.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr Paolatto.

We will end the session with that speaker. We will break at this point, and I am going to suggest to the members of the committee that we try to get back as close to 6.15 as we can. I realize that is a short break, but under the circumstances I think we need to try to do the best that we can. What we will do at that point is begin with the list of speakers that we have on the evening list, and we will have some time at the end of that to add some of the people who have indicated an interest in speaking. There will also be some other additions to the printed list that we have.

KATHY KORENICH

Ms Korenich: Chairman, I would like to speak. I have someone with a medical problem that I have to assist. I cannot stay.

The Chair: Are you on the list for this evening, ma'am?

Ms Korenich: I requested today.

The Chair: I am sorry. Well, it is up to what the committee wants to do.

Ms Churley: Can you do it in five minutes?

Ms Korenich: I will try my best.

The Chair: The committee is willing to give you five minutes, ma'am. All right. If you would come forward, we will give you five minutes. Could we have your name, please, for the record?

Ms Korenich: My name is Kathy Korenich. Thank you very much for allowing me these five minutes. This

has been a subject of great interest to me, and had my father been alive today, I am sure he would be here too, supporting me.

I am here to express for myself and for a multitude of others who share the same beliefs our stance on Ontario in Confederation. Let me tell you this: I already am bilingual, as are a great majority of Canadians. One language is English, but the other is not French. For the same reasons that the majority of Canadians immigrated to this new country, our ancestors came with hopes of a new, better and democratic life for themselves and their families. They realized that they were in a new country and wanted to belong. The majority of immigrants learned the common language, English, and the customs of the country. These same families realized that if they were to keep their heritage alive, they would have to do it, and did, even beyond the family unit, by forming and building at their own expense churches, meeting halls—you are in one right now—clubs, newspapers, language schools, concerts, dance groups, orchestras, and the list goes on and on.

1750

The French, we believe, as bilingual, should be doing the same, yet all of us already bilingual Canadians are forced to accept and pay dearly for the preservation of the French language rights and their culture because with these acts they set themselves apart. All people should be treated equal. This is not the case. I do not consider myself racist, but I do consider their demands on us people, as Canadians, as being racist.

This first was accomplished through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms by a small group of Canadians, intellectuals and politicians who were elected to represent the majority but selected a dictatorial attitude. This was too important not to put to a direct vote to the people who would have to live with and pay for it for the rest of their lives. But it was not even good enough for Quebec.

And along comes the Meech Lake accord, which was to recognize Quebec as a distinct society and bring it into the fold. Thank God for people like Elijah Harper and Clyde Wells, who spoke for those who had no chance to vote and be heard. We also are thankful for the subsequent defeat of David Peterson, the so-called Captain Canada. He did not listen to the voices of the Ontario citizens.

We are not stupid not to realize that "distinct" was the foot in the door, so to speak, to allow Bourassa and the francophones to realize anything and everything they wanted. Everyone, especially the French, forget that this land we call Canada was already occupied when the French first landed. But the French have made it clear with the events at Oka, after Meech failed, that they do not give a damn that today these same natives are a minority like themselves and have no real special privileges. They do not give a damn except for those who single out themselves and give them special privileges and authority. Ultimately, it is those people who needed a golf course. It cost

a life and it is going to cost us taxpayers in purchase of land for those natives.

Much was made in the run-up of the Meech Lake accord over a small group of veterans who trampled the Quebec flag in Brockville, yet flag burning became the rage in Quebec and neither the political leaders nor the media dared to make much of it. The anti-English sign laws in Quebec show a disturbing streak of fascism and outright racism, and yet the news that youth in Quebec were paid or rewarded to seek out "English only" signs was only an obscure article even in our Windsor Star.

There is the case of the Montreal school board official, an Indian from India, who had to go to the Ontario Human Rights Commission to get his job back. He was fired because he did not speak French with the correct accent. And yet our federal government takes it upon itself recently, and hands over control of immigration only to Quebec, in the name of linguistic and cultural freedom.

Federal Minister of Communications Marcel Masse announced a few days ago plans to set up a new \$45-million cultural institute in Montreal, using our tax dollars, while severe cuts to the CBC last December caused local programming to be slashed at television stations across Canada, including Windsor. Pray tell, what is that supposed to tell us other Canadians?

The Chair: Ms Korenich, if you could sum up, we have gone beyond the five minutes.

Ms Korenich: I would like to sum up in saying that I am a Canadian and I am proud to be Canadian. But I also feel that everybody should be treated equal. I have the right to speak my language anywhere I choose to with anybody who can understand me, and I will exercise that. I feel that is a right that should be given to anyone, but I think only one language in this country can unite this country.

We have a number of economic issues. We are in a deficit position. We are spending millions of dollars on this constitutional debacle and the French-language issue. We do not spend the money and we deprive issues that are humane, that not only take care of health and welfare but also our underprivileged and our sick and elderly. Those are the areas we should be spending our money in first, before we spend it elsewhere.

Common sense has to prevail. Look at the human issue. These hearings are conducted to demonstrate a democratic process. If the democratic process that you want is to exist, put it to the vote. Then all the people in Ontario can vote and accept the results and live with them.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We will break at this point, and given that we have extended the time, we could come back at about 6:25. Thank you very much.

The committee recessed at 1758.

EVENING SITTING

The committee resumed at 1828.

The Chair: I call the meeting to order. On behalf of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation, I welcome the people who are here with us this evening. We are in the Teutonia Club of Windsor, continuing our hearings in our travels across the province. We want to explain that we have been delayed in our proceedings today because of weather problems in Toronto; we were delayed coming into Windsor. We extended the session this afternoon and will do the same with the session this evening.

We have a number of speakers to hear from this evening and we will do our best to accommodate those as well as some additional people who want to speak to us, groups and individuals. We will do our best to accommodate those within the realm of reason. We will ask if people can also help us by limiting their comments to whatever extent is possible.

I did not do this earlier, also in the rush for time, but I do want to introduce the members of the committee. We are, of course, a committee made up of members of the three political parties which are represented at Queen's Park. We have from the NDP caucus Gary Malkowski, Gilles Bisson, who is also the Vice-Chair of the committee, Marilyn Churley, David Winninger, Ellen MacKinnon and George Dadamo. From the Liberal caucus we have Charles Beer, Yvonne O'Neill and Steven Offer. From the Conservative caucus we are awaiting at any time the arrival of Ernie Eves, and Ted Arnott is here with us.

We are not quite at full strength, as you can see; some of the members of our group are still trying to get here. I was commenting earlier that it is ironic that when we travelled in the last two weeks through the north and north-central region of the province we had absolutely no problems with the weather. In fact, we had some of the most beautiful weather we have managed to have. Mr Bisson, who is from that area, claims some responsibility for co-ordinating that for us. We obviously did not put anybody in charge of the weather in Toronto, and that was the problem in us being delayed in getting here today.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY

The Chair: In any event, we are pleased this evening to begin by inviting the Honourable Howard Pawley to come forward and talk with us. We are very pleased as a committee that Mr Pawley asked to come and speak to us.

Hon Mr Pawley: It is a pleasure for me to be here and to greet the members of the commission to Windsor, certainly dealing with a matter which is of paramount importance to Ontario and more particularly to Canada as a whole, at a time which is critical, at a time in which Canada cries for leadership. Your commission has a unique opportunity to provide that kind of leadership at a time when Canadians are expecting it.

To commence, I believe that Canadians are depressed about the Allaire report, a report which would dismantle Canada. They are appalled, as I mentioned, at the lack of leadership available to contend with those various proposals.

The statements by the Premier of Quebec as well as those of the Prime Minister lack any consideration of an alternative articulation. We are placed upon dangerous ground. If Canada is to become an arrangement or a looser form of sovereignty association bound only by economic ties, then we are witnessing the end of what we call Canada.

We must maintain a strong Canada, one which was associated with the advent of progressive taxation after the First World War; the development of old age pensions in 1927; the Rowell-Sirois commission in 1941, which recommended federal intervention in order to ease regional disparities; the assumption, with provincial approval, of unemployment insurance in 1940; the development of family allowances; federal funding for the Trans-Canada Highway; equalization payments; and, most important, the development of medicare covering all Canadians.

A strong central government is good for Ontario, but as well good for Canada. Canadians will not accept alterations which prevent the kind of future progressive reforms which I mentioned have occurred previously. Having been a signatory to the Meech Lake accord, I recognize the need for accommodation. However, we must not sacrifice the advantages of a federal system which historically has accomplished much, a system enjoying the flexibility to either centralize or decentralize power dependent on the needs of the time. I have distributed a chart which demonstrates the ebb and flow of federal-provincial relations during the 123 years of Confederation, demonstrating the flexibility of our existing constitutional arrangement to move from periods of centralization to periods of decentralization.

I want to also mention to you at this stage that during the time I served in various roles in the Manitoba government, some 19 years, as well as seven years as Premier of Manitoba, I did not feel restricted in my ability, in my government's ability, including the seven years as Premier of Manitoba, to accomplish that which I wished to do within the provincial realm for Manitoba. The only area I felt some restrictions was in the introduction of a sufficiently broad and general tax reform initiative which could bring about the kind of fiscal flexibility that one requires in order to undertake social and economic programs of importance.

Canada's Constitution should be structured to provide a framework which will permit maximum economic growth, the reduction of regional disparities throughout Canada, and the maintenance of a satisfactory level of public services with a fair sharing of costs. We must not weaken the central government's ability to achieve economic success in an international competitive environment.

Any division of powers should provide for constitutional amendments which strengthen the capacity for all Canadians to achieve their social and economic destinies. Some social programs' powers may be delivered in a manner which reflects Canada's diversity by constitutionally permitting provinces to opt out of federal programs which are being provided in areas of provincial jurisdiction. Conditionally, a province would be entitled to financial compensation in the

event of such opting out if that province were able to establish a program which satisfied national standards. In addition, it is my view that we should recognize the distinctiveness of Quebec's cultural and linguistic distinctiveness.

To meet the exigencies of the 1990s, the central government should exercise responsibility for the environment as well for interprovincial trade barriers. Amendment to section 121 of the Constitution Act would be required in that instance.

Ontario, in the interests of a united and strong, vibrant nation, must encourage the reduction of disparities, to promote greater equality among Canadians wherever they work or reside. Increased disparities represented by the undoing of public services like Via Rail, rural post offices, public air service, the imposition of a cap on established programs financing for universities and health, and the slashing of public broadcasting, so very important to the Windsor area, are coincidental with moves to harmonize Canada into the American economy, moves which will diminish the capacity of Canadians to transcend differences and distances, and thus for us to create a more caring society.

Section 36 of the Canadian Constitution, 1982, enshrines the principle of reducing economic disparities and the provision of public programs and services, including health and education, for all Canadians at comparable tax rates. Section 36(2) has been given little more than lipservice by both past and present federal governments. This provision should be rewritten to require compliance in the future by Canadian governments.

Much has been said of the growth in western Canada of the need for a triple E Senate. Let me report to you that it my understanding that the present Manitoba legislative committee on the Constitution has received little enthusiasm for such Senate reform, while on the other hand many submissions have proposed Senate abolition.

My experience, while Premier of Manitoba in 1986, with that famous CF-18 fiasco led me to believe that the triple E Senate concept would not have been helpful. My preference would be for a limited number of members of Parliament, elected by proportional representation, which would reflect regional concerns in each party's caucus. These members of Parliament would be in addition to the existing House of Commons composition. Such a system would replace the existing Senate.

Priority should be applied to the long-unaddressed issue of constitutional entrenchment of the principle of aboriginal self-government, coupled with a government commitment to give expression to that principle in subsequent talks with native peoples. Hopefully, greater success can be realized than that which was achieved in the unsuccessful attempts undertaken from 1982 to 1987. Canadians are aware that our first peoples can no longer be relegated to the sidelines in any discussions that involve Canada's future. The debacle of the Meech Lake accord and of Oka testify to that.

1840

In summation, the new course or direction in Canada must involve a recognition that Canada consists of more than economics and that we are not measured by monetary

value alone. Our collective responsibility is to establish programs to ensure that the abundance which is Canada, along with our resources and our wealth, can be redistributed to all Canadians through mutual and useful and meaningful economic and social programs, programs that will unify the Canadian fabric by reduction of the social and economic disparities that presently exist. It is critical not only to respect the diversity that exists between French and English Canada but among all Canadians in a multicultural and bilingual society, as well as the full recognition of Canada's aboriginal peoples. Canadians will insist upon a clear alternative vision, an alternative vision that will replace the unfortunately destructive path which has been pursued in the past decade.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Pawley. There are, I know, a number of questions. I think we will try to do our best to accommodate those requests.

Mr Winninger: It is rather exciting to get to speak to a Premier who was actually present at the Meech Lake process. I wanted to ask you if you had any inkling or intimation that the Meech Lake agreement might be torpedoed by the native concerns as well as women's concerns and multicultural groups, all of whom were not consulted with in any meaningful way when the Meech Lake process unfolded.

Hon Mr Pawley: Certainly I had clear indication in 1987 that there would be opposition. In fact, in 1987 former Premier Peterson and myself at the Langevin Block were extremely concerned about what we felt, at that time, was an oversight, that there was no doubt that the sexual equality and the concerns of our aboriginal Canadians were not dealt with. Elijah Harper, in 1987—I want to indicate this to you—was very upfront and honest with me, as Premier of Manitoba, and indicated to me that if Meech, as we had agreed to in 1987, came to a vote in the Manitoba Legislature he would vote against it.

I think what we should have learned from Meech, but I hope we will learn in the period ahead, is that we no longer proceed in a way that does not engage the public in participation. I believe you are doing that here. Manitoba had a process, a process which was written into the law of the province, which required 10 days of discussion in the Legislature, required presentations and hearings throughout the province, and then a further opportunity for the legislators to make changes and improvements to the accord.

The Prime Minister was warned in June of 1987 that Manitoba would pursue that course, that our support was one only in principle. It was a compromise, but the Prime Minister was warned, as were other premiers, that Manitoba might be very well be back at the negotiating table because of our particular process in Manitoba.

I believe any shortcut, any ignoring of the wisdom of people in participating, is bound to lead to the backlash that was generated over Meech Lake. My regret is not in the substance of Meech Lake. My everlasting regret is that the process was so bastardized as to bring about the kind of result that occurred last year.

Mr Offer: Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts on this matter. It is going to be crucially important to this committee as we go through our hearings and hear from so many people to get, certainly, the perspective of an individual such as yourself. I want to thank you for taking the time to share that with us.

I have two questions. On your first page, you talk about an "alternative articulation" of Bourassa's statements as well as the statements of the Prime Minister. I am wondering if you might be able to expand upon what you view as that alternative articulation. As you will know, there is discussion in Quebec about an increase in provincial powers now exercised by the federal government. I want to know if the alternative articulation is one which is just the retention of a strong central government or if there is something else you could share with us.

Second, something which I as well as others have been grappling with, there are currently discussions between Quebec and the federal government dealing with the whole question of redefined federalism, division of powers, whatever. What did you see as the role of the other provinces in those discussions? Is there a role? Is there not a role? If there is, what might that role be?

Hon Mr Pawley: First, in so far as the latter question is concerned, there must be a role for all provinces in these discussions, and the involvement of all provinces must ensure there is also involvement of Canadians. There is just no way that there can take place bilateral discussions with the government in Ottawa and the government of Quebec. All provinces must be involved, and the sooner that is recognized by Premier Bourassa the better we all will be in this important process of renewing federalism.

The alternative vision: Pierre Elliott Trudeau used to refer to "shopping plaza federalism." It was the way Pierre Trudeau used to refer to the "community of communities" approach of Joe Clark in 1979-80. I think there is much in what is being proposed now in 1991 in the Allaire report, much in the musings of the present Prime Minister, that reflect back to that community of communities, that shopping plaza approach.

I am prepared to recognize that it will be critical to update and to rethink our approach. This is 1991. But in the international market, in a situation in which we are faced with tremendous disparities in this country, when there are immense social problems to be dealt with as well and a major debt that must be contended with, I think the federal government must enjoy the kind of economic powers that are necessary in order to deal with that. So I am very concerned about any vision that would diminish the federal government's economic power.

On the other hand, I believe there is room to reflect the diversity of this nation, the regions. I am very conscious of the west, the Atlantic and Quebec. I think we must reflect the different peculiarities in different regions. That is why I think it is important that we proceed to an agreement for full financial compensation when the federal government launches new national programs in areas of provincial jurisdiction, subject to those programs being compatible with national standards—I know Meech Lake said "objectives." I was worried about "objectives." It may be that we will

have to accept "objectives." I would prefer "standards"—to reflect the fact that there is diversity in this great country of ours.

I think it is also important that we recognize the distinctiveness of Quebec's cultural and linguistic characteristics. Also, if I could just add, and I hope the committee will examine this, I think a Canadian clause would be important, one that will note the aboriginal origins of Canada, the duality of Canada, the distinctiveness of Quebec, but also will reflect the multicultural future of Canada. You might want to examine a Canadian clause that will reflect Canada 1991 and not—I know how people cringe when we refer to charter groups—the English and the French. It gets the back of a lot of people up. I think we have to look at a Canadian clause, a clause that is going to embrace all Canadians rather than allow some Canadians to feel they are second-rate, second-class, in this process.

1850

Mr Arnott: I want to first of all state what a privilege it is to have a national statesman addressing us this evening and giving us his opinions.

You have stated in your submission that you recognize the need for the accommodation of Quebec's interests. One of the problems I see in Ontario and in Canada today is that a lot of people do not want to recognize that there is need for accommodation of Quebec. Can you explain in your own words why we need to accommodate Quebec's interests?

Hon Mr Pawley: I have very deep worries if we fail to accommodate the Quebec situation—without the price of emasculating Canada. I want to make that very clear, because I am concerned about the extent to which we move to meet the pressures from Quebec. My concern, of course, is that if we fail to do so then I do not know what happens in so far as Atlantic Canada is concerned, whether it is going to be feasible for Atlantic Canada to continue to be part of Canada or whether it will eventually break away, be integrated into the United States. I fear very much what is going to happen in British Columbia and in Alberta. In the final analysis, I can see an absorption take place with parts of western Canada—Manitoba never, but BC and Alberta potentially so. I fear a gradual fragmentation taking place across Canada, that 50 years from now we would not recognize the land we know now as a result of the picking away of different parts of this country in the north-south alliance. I must say that I am worried about the north-south, and a diminishing of our ability to maintain ourselves as a strong nation.

Therefore, I say let's keep our economic power strong. Let's keep the central government strong. It has to raise the funds in order to redistribute income. It has to be able to pay down the debt. It has to promote economic growth. Let's not interfere with that, but let's recognize that there is much diversity in this country. Surely we are all broad-minded enough and big enough that we can recognize that all parts of this country have a great deal to offer—Atlantic, Quebec, west, British Columbia.

Mr Malkowski: Thank you very much for your invaluable perceptions throughout this evening. It has given

us a lot to think about. I know one problem we are faced with, and have been, is the process, as you specifically stated with Meech Lake, as well as leadership on the federal level. That reflects all the problems. I am wondering if you feel that Ontario should take a leadership role in negotiations with Quebec as well as the communication with the federal. We seem to think we need a strong leadership role, and I am wondering if you feel Ontario can have some kind of effect with Quebec to rethink this.

Hon Mr Pawley: Unfortunately, at this time—with all due respect to my former colleagues who were premiers—I do not see much alternative leadership available. Most of the premiers have already been fairly or unfairly—indeed I was—tainted by the Meech Lake process. The Prime Minister certainly carries that burden as well. I think Ontario, being the largest, most populated—35% of Canada's population—not tainted by the debacle of 1987 to 1990, can provide that kind of leadership. I think Ontario has by way of history the capacity to be more sensitive, more sensitive as far as Quebec is concerned but also sensitive as far as the west is concerned.

I was much more optimistic, let me say this to you, six or eight months ago, about how we could work our way through this impasse. I am less certain now because there are so many irreconcilable differences across this country of ours, from the Allaire report in Quebec to what are very uncompromising positions in western Canada, positions which I carry some scars from in years gone by. It is going to be very difficult. I do not see any other actor at this time that has the credibility and the strength and the accessibility and sensitivity to do that but Ontario.

Mr Beer: One of the things we have been told rather bluntly by a number of witnesses is that one of the differences now with our hearings is that we have to recognize that Quebec may in fact separate. We are trying to have a look at the whole country and what is going to happen, and it seems to me that one of the things we have to do in our work is look at how that links to the west.

Manitoba in many ways has always had a unique role. You are part of the west but very close, of course, to Ontario, and often the approach has been somewhat different. Regardless of how the country evolves, whether it is a separate Quebec or some other form of association, what are some of the critical things we must not forget about the new relationship with the west? You mention in your paper that perhaps having some proportional representation in the House of Commons would begin to deal with some of the regional problems, but what other things might you remind us of as we go about our work, so that we recognize what is happening in the west and how that would be reflected in a new Canada?

Hon Mr Pawley: I am glad you mentioned that the west is not monolithic. Sometimes people make the mistake of referring to the attitudes of western Canada and the western Reform Party. The western Reform Party is still principally an Alberta phenomenon. It is not one that is pronounced by way of strength or viewpoint in the province of Manitoba nor in Saskatchewan. But I think the

west does require a mechanism by which it can ensure that its regional concerns are better reflected and understood.

That is why there is this tremendous support in Alberta, and to some extent in British Columbia, scatterings of it elsewhere, for the triple E Senate. The reason I said the triple E Senate in my view would not be sensible—in the CF-18 fiasco, when the party whip was used, premiers Devine and Getty and Don Mazankowski all supported that fiasco, when the west was being prejudiced. That CF-18 fiasco gave rise to impetus that helped the western Reform Party a great deal. I have to whisper to you that the only support I got from a western Premier was Bill Vander Zalm. But I think that demonstrates that a triple E Senate would not in some way or other reflect western concern, it would reflect the party whip.

Thinking about this, I have come to the view that we retain the membership we have now in the House of Commons, we elect some additional members on the basis of proportional representation but ensure that the proportional lists reflect the regions of Canada, so we never again have a situation where there are no Liberals in the western caucus, as there was during the 1970s—there would be some with proportional representation; no Conservatives from Quebec, again as there was in the 1970s; no New Democrats from Quebec as there was during the 1970s and throughout most of the 1980s; that we would have some input through some system of proportional representation. There are plenty of models for that: Europe has many models of proportional representation. If that is not acceptable, I think the next best route is to look at a House of the Provinces.

1900

One more point I want to emphasize, because I do not want us to forget, my reference to 36(2) of the Constitution is not important as far as Ontario is concerned. In fact, Ontario historically has at some times been cool—not during the time of Peterson nor the time of Rae but on some occasions previously—to equalization. But I do not think we can permit continued cutbacks in equalization to less-well-off regions of this country, caps on established programs financing that are taking place at the present time, without soon reaching an occasion when the divisions will deepen, the social friction will intensify, and rather than moving towards a much more harmonious kind of relationship we will be contributing to the reverse.

Ontario may have to take a lead that may at times appear to be contrary to its own interests, in the larger interests: regional sensitivity, supporting equalization for the have-not areas of this country. That includes Saskatchewan and Manitoba and the Atlantic provinces and Quebec—\$3 billion to Quebec on an annual basis, an important item as far as Quebec is concerned. Ontario has to be prepared to be broad-minded enough and fair enough and equitable enough in its approach to divorce itself from a narrow-minded approach. Probably only Ontario has the size and the strength and the population that it can afford to do that.

Mr Bisson: A quick question on the amending formula: One of the things we have been hearing before the committee is that there needs to be a change with regard to

the way the amending formula works. Some people argue it is too inflexible; others say it should remain the same. What are your thoughts on that?

Hon Mr Pawley: Politics, as you all know, is the art of the possible. In 1987, Meech Lake, we all agreed to unanimity. I look back with some regret at that, because we paralyzed our amendment process. I wish we could agree 7 out of 10 with 50% of the population. I think we would be much better if we could do that, leave unanimity in a few limited areas. That would be my preference. The issue is going to develop with Quebec's insistence upon a veto. I wish we could compromise to the extent that we recognize the cultural and linguistic distinctiveness of Quebec. In those areas I think we are going to be required, realistically, to accept some veto in so far as Quebec is concerned.

I say that with some hesitation, being from the west, because I do not know whether you can sell that to western Canada. But if we are not prepared to attempt that minimum, I do not know how in the world we are going to bring about a compromise that will keep Quebec within the Canadian family.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Pawley. That is the end of the questions. I just wanted to say, in thanking you on behalf of the committee, that I think all of us will remember this day in Windsor for a number of reasons but certainly one of them will be the chance we have had to talk with you and to hear your views. You have challenged us, I think, as others have, to try to begin to articulate a clear alternative vision of what Canada is and can become. We appreciate the kinds of things that you have suggested need to go into that new vision of Canada.

Hon Mr Pawley: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

LE RÉSEAU DES FEMMES DU SUD DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: We want to go back at this point and invite one of the speakers who was not able to be with us earlier today, Lucienne Bushnell, du comité d'Essex-Kent du Réseau des femmes du Sud de l'Ontario.

Mme Bushnell : Nous vous remercions de l'opportunité de participer aux audiences en vue de déterminer le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération dans le débat sur l'avenir du Canada.

Le comité d'Essex-Kent du Réseau des femmes du Sud de l'Ontario est l'un des huit groupes d'action communautaire qui forme le réseau. Le réseau est un organisme bénévole qui, depuis sa création en 1982, travaille à l'amélioration des conditions de vie des femmes francophones de la région. Nos dossiers prioritaires du réseau sont : la prévention de la violence faite aux femmes ; l'identification de ressources disponibles aux femmes ; la création de services en français pour les femmes ; et le développement personnel et le mieux-être des femmes.

Nous fonctionnons par consultation pour arriver à bâtir un consensus parmi nous et la société. En tant que femmes francophones, nous voulons briser l'isolement historique dans lequel nous vivons depuis toujours. Le fait d'être

francophones nous situe comme minorité linguistique à l'intérieur d'une minorité qu'est celle des femmes.

Nous aimerions souligner le fait qu'il y a des femmes francophones dans notre région, dans la région de Windsor, depuis déjà plus de 290 années. En effet, c'est en 1701 que le Sieur de Lamothe Cadillac partait de Montréal en compagnie de 100 hommes pour venir établir une colonie agricole sur les rives de la rivière Détroit. Durant l'automne de cette même année, son épouse venait le rejoindre pour y établir domicile.

Nous appuyons sans réserve les démarches entreprises par l'Ontario en vue d'établir son rôle au sein de la Confédération. Mais je crois qu'il faut admettre que ces discussions se font de façon si active parce que le Québec est sur le point de choisir sa destinée qui peut très bien signifier son départ de la Confédération canadienne. Peut-être est-ce dû au fait que nous nous sentons souvent marginalisées en tant que femmes francophones, que nous écoutons les discours des Québécois avec beaucoup d'empathie. Nous acceptons que le Québec choisisse sa destinée en se basant sur les besoins de ses citoyens. Par contre, nous croyons que la présence du Québec au sein de la Confédération est avantageuse pour tout le Canada. L'effet historique indique selon nous que l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle très important dans le débat qui s'amorce sur l'avenir du Canada.

Nous réalisons que ces audiences ont été établies dans le but de fournir aux citoyens et aux citoyennes de l'Ontario une opportunité de faire connaître leurs vues sur le Canada de demain. Comme représentantes de femmes francophones, nous nous en tiendrons aux questions qui nous concernent le plus.

Un aspect de l'identité canadienne est sûrement le fait que nous sommes un pays bilingue et multiculturel. Un autre aspect qui nous différencie de nos voisins les Américains est la valeur que nous donnons à nos programmes sociaux. Comme Canadiennes, nous sommes très fières de notre système d'assurance-maladie, de la pension de vieillesse et divers autres programmes d'aide financière. Nous sommes aussi fières que nos villes soient moins violentes que celles des États-Unis.

Mais lorsque nous regardons de plus près les statistiques, l'image que nous avons de notre société n'est pas aussi idéale que nous la croyons. Les femmes sont souvent victimes de violence ; une femme sur cinq est victime d'agression sexuelle. Chaque année des milliers de femmes sont battues par leur conjoint ; plusieurs d'entre elles meurent de leurs blessures. La liberté des femmes est sérieusement réduite par le constant danger d'agression.

De plus, la situation économique des femmes est beaucoup moins bonne que celle des hommes. Une famille sur quatre dirigée par une femme est pauvre. Le salaire moyen des femmes est environ 60% de celui des hommes.

Nous devons valoriser la personne dans son individualité sans perdre de vue que l'individu a aussi une responsabilité envers la société. Il faut développer une volonté collective d'assurer la dignité de la personne et le respect qui lui est dû comme être humain.

1910

Les Canadiens aiment croire qu'ils ne sont pas racistes. En réalité, il y a beaucoup d'intolérance envers les groupes

minoritaires. De plus, les groupes minoritaires se sentent souvent en compétition entre eux. Trop de gens semblent croire que les besoins des uns sont satisfait par le détrimement des autres. Il faut changer l'approche qui est trop compétitive et à courte échéance et se tourner vers des buts à long terme et agir de façon collaborative. Il faut apprendre à réaliser que chaque fois qu'un groupe a l'opportunité de s'actualiser, le Canada en entier est enrichi.

Comment pouvons-nous mieux répondre aux besoins et aux aspirations de nos minorités linguistiques ? Je crois qu'il y a vraiment deux niveaux. Le premier est de nous fournir les services dont nous avons besoin tels qu'identifiés par nous. En d'autres mots, les services sont basés non pas sur des droits, mais sur la reconnaissance de notre capacité d'identifier nos besoins.

Le deuxième est de reconnaître nos capacités de gérer nos propres institutions. Je parle ici au nom des francophones mais aussi d'autres minorités comme les minorités autochtones. Je n'ai pas vraiment couvert ça dans mon mémoire parce que je suis sûre que c'est une communauté qui peut très bien s'identifier et faire ses propres demandes, mais en tant que francophones nous appuyons aussi les demandes des autochtones. Pour les francophones qui habitent dans les régions désignées bilingues selon la Loi sur les services en français, ceci est en voie de réalisation. Nous félicitons le gouvernement de l'Ontario pour la reconnaissance de l'apport des francophones au patrimoine de l'Ontario et de son désir de le sauvegarder pour les générations futures. Nous vous encourageons à continuer à enrayer la marginalisation des francophones en Ontario.

J'aimerais attirer votre attention sur le fait que le système démocratique est un très bon système pour la majorité. C'est un système qui doit être tempéré par le désir de justice et de respect pour les minorités. C'est pourquoi nous croyons que bien que l'opinion populaire soit à la base des décisions gouvernementales, il demeure que les gouvernements municipal, provincial et fédéral doivent faire preuve de leadership dans les questions touchant les minorités. Une des responsabilités des gouvernements est de permettre à tous l'opportunité de vivre avec dignité et d'être citoyens et citoyennes à part entière.

Quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada ? Nous croyons que la reconnaissance officielle du caractère distinct du Québec est conforme à notre conception du Canada et de la Confédération. D'ailleurs, le groupe de travail sur l'unité canadienne sous la coprésidence de John Roberts, ancien premier ministre de l'Ontario, a identifié les six caractéristiques distinctes de la société québécoise moderne suivantes : il y avait l'histoire ; la prédominance de la langue française ; le droit civil et la common law ; l'origine ethnique commune de la majorité de la population ; les désirs, les aspirations et même les craintes similaires à ceux de la population du Québec ; le rôle unique que la politique et le gouvernement du Québec jouent pour façonner la société québécoise.

Nous croyons que lors des premières discussions sur la Confédération, le Québec était vu comme une province qui occuperait une place spéciale au sein de la Confédération. Le Québec a toujours eu la responsabilité de protéger la culture et le patrimoine francophones. Depuis 1759, le Canada

français se débat pour survivre dans une Amérique du Nord anglophone et c'est en partie grâce à son succès que le Canada est un pays bilingue offrant aux Canadiens cette caractéristique dans leur identité. Il faut aussi reconnaître que le Québec a joué un rôle important pour le Canada dans l'établissement du commerce avec les pays francophones au sein de l'économie mondiale.

L'Ontario et le Québec sont partenaires depuis près de 300 ans. Nous croyons que les liens établis devraient faciliter le dialogue entre le Québec et l'Ontario. En effet, il nous semble que l'Ontario est appelé à jouer un rôle central dans les discussions à venir. L'Ontario devrait prendre soin de ne pas laisser ces discussions constitutionnelles endommager cette relation que nous avons avec le Québec. Car, advenant l'échec des discussions et la séparation du Québec, il est fort possible qu'il y ait une fragmentation du Canada tel que nous le connaissons. Mais quoiqu'il adienne, la géographie dicte que le Québec et l'Ontario continueront à partager une très grande frontière et nous voudrions sûrement pouvoir maintenir avec le Québec nos liens économiques et culturels.

En conclusion, nous souhaitons que l'Ontario protège ses minorités francophones si le débat constitutionnel augmente l'animosité des Ontariens d'expression anglaise contre elles. De plus, nous voulons réitérer notre désir que l'avenir de l'Ontario soit fondé sur une base de justice et de respect pour tous et toutes. Merci.

M. le Président : Merci, madame. Il y a quelques questions.

Ms Churley : Thank you for your presentation. I am happy to hear from a woman tonight. I am just wondering if you have a relationship with Québécois women, and as well, do you think Canada can remain a country, stay together, be able to satisfy Quebec's needs to realize its goals, and in doing so, be able to maintain the social programs you talked about that are so important to women in Quebec and in every province in this country, and also the gains that we have made over the years for equality for women.

Do you think it is possible? I know that is a big question, but of course, it is still very important to women who were involved in Meech that we find ways, across the country, to not lose those gains that we have made over the years.

Ms Bushnell : I think the people of Quebec found their identity. They had been searching for their identity since, really, the 1940s and the 1950s. In the 1960s they began to really find their identity and I think they have travelled a long way.

I think they consider themselves as Canadians and I think it will be a very difficult decision for them to make, should separation occur. I think it will be very painful. However, I think that as the rest of Canada we have to look at it as, "Can we really force them to stay?" I think that unless we are willing to march in an army, which I do not think we intend to do, we cannot hold them against their will.

I believe it is important in discussion to truly hear what they say. I think the disaster of Meech Lake in Quebec was

not that people said, "Oh, it didn't work out." The message I was hearing from people who live there was: "They haven't heard us. They don't understand. They have not even listened."

That is why I think we have to be more open and to be able to really, truly listen to what it is. They are afraid. They have been a minority inside Canada. It is hard to be a minority. I think as women, we are not a numerical minority. However, we are in fact when it comes to take decisions that affect us and I think this is what we are trying to change. I think this is what Quebec is trying to change.

I agree that if Quebec leaves, I am very pessimistic how we can keep Canada together. They are not on the edge of Canada. They are right smack in the middle. They are a large population and it is a very great concern that it should happen.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Thank you so much, Ms Bushnell. I want to tell you that you are the second woman who has come before me in the city of Windsor—the other happened to be a woman taxi driver—to explain to me just the difference that the river makes in the level of violence. I really think that is a very important point to bring to such a committee. There are very few communities that are as close to an alternative as you are, and you make that very strong distinction and you make it from a different perspective, the women's perspective.

As you know the mandate of this committee is to look at values and to look at social and economic aspirations. You mentioned that sometimes we in government give you things or present laws that we see needs for, but maybe do not respond to real needs. I wonder if you could say a little bit about some of the needs you see that we have not responded to or your aspirations, so that we could then have some new guidance about the way in which we could respond to those.

1920

Ms Bushnell: I think, actually, I would like to commend the government on making violence done to women really a priority. I think things are moving in the right direction. However, I think that although the laws are there, the way they are implemented is also a very large part of the problem. I think that in our culture women for a long time were seen as really property of their husband. We are in the process of changing this.

I think the law has to make it very clear, and I think progress from the government and I think the publicity, the campaigns that the Ontario women's directorate does, for example, every November, these campaigns should be really fully supported. I think it is a question of public education. We have to change the perception, the way women are seen.

I think one of them is to equality, to job equality, to money, to be paid the same salary or an equivalent salary. I think it is tragic to see, for example, that the women who are working in day care are paid less than, I understand, zoo keepers. We have to change the values we put on the jobs that women do, because for many years we have done this job of caring for the next generation, and unfortunately this was done by women at home, and because there was

no dollar sign attached to it, I think it is perceived as having not much value.

I think a society values what costs. Unfortunately, the work that women have done has not cost and therefore is not valued enough. I think any programs that change that, any women who recognize the contribution that women do in society, whether it is through paid work or unpaid work, will help change this perception that society has of women and will improve our lot.

MORGAN ELLIOTT

Mr Elliott: Thank you for affording me this opportunity to address your select committee. Let me start off by asking a question that all Canadians should think about every once in while, "What makes Canada Canada?" Is it the fact that there is western alienation towards central Canada, or the francophone or anglophone perceived resentment towards each other, or is it the Maritimes' feelings of inequity with the rest of Canada?

These are subjects which many people have addressed and many books have been written about. But in my opinion Canada is a country that helps each other, a country that cheers on its hockey teams to gold, a country whose war veterans strived to protect our interests and brought dignity to our flag wherever it was seen. Ask a Québécois or an Albertan or someone from the Yukon if they are American and they will resolutely proclaim that they are Canadian. It is now time for Canada to help itself.

I too am a proud waver of a red and white maple leaf. I am speaking tonight as a Canadian first and Ontario second. It troubles me greatly that our country seems so torn apart, so close to breaking up. If it were not for my own travels, I would never have believed that a majority of Canadians would want to stick together. As a country our problems are great, but they can and should be addressed.

I would like to take this opportunity as an armchair constitutionalist, to express what I see as a solution to Canada's problems and what I perceive as Ontario's major role that it can play in solving them.

The recent privatization and dismantling of crown corporations by the federal government is a shameful travesty. Through government mismanagement, Via Rail cutbacks have caused some Canadians to lose valuable links that reduce the distances within Canada. I was under the impression that one of the main purposes of a crown corporation was to provide services that were deemed to be of national interest, services that the public sector could not provide due to economic reasons.

The present streamlining of the CBC, especially here in Windsor, is beyond comprehension. According to their own chairman designate, Patrick Watson, the purpose of the CBC's Canada mandate is to convey the "telling of our stories, the singing of our songs and the dancing of our dance." Here in Windsor, our songs tell about Toronto accident rates, Detroit crime and corruption and American troops in the Gulf. How can Windsor and the rest of Canada effectively and visually see what is occurring if we have maybe one or two reporters sorting through hundreds of cases a month to maybe have a Windsor piece once in a while?

The CBC provides a community link that betters the area, which in turn betters Canada. Before coming to school in Windsor, I used to watch the Toronto news in St Catharines, but upon my arrival watched the local CBC broadcasts. It helped me to achieve a sense of community and that I belonged to the city of Windsor. I think I know how people feel here. They now have practically no local, special interest or news coverage. Some might argue that local coverage might foster regionalism, but I do not subscribe to that view. How are we supposed to know about the rest of the country when our own local news gathering is hampered?

The issue is the CBC severed, almost completely, TV services in a market that is already inundated by American news outlets. If the gateway to Canada is not looked after, what will happen to the rest of Canada? What will happen to what is left of the rest of the CBC? The Ontario government must step up its pressure on the federal government and back all cities that are fighting to restore their services.

Education, along with health care services, needs to be strengthened, not weakened, not reduced to the point where programs have to be reduced or cut to make budgetary restrictions. The federal government has told the province that if Quebec leaves Confederation, we will experience a decrease in these equalization and transfer payments. I come to wonder how the government arrived at this position, especially with the fact that we are faced with decreasing transfer payments and equalization payments to other provinces each year. It is estimated that these payments will be further reduced by eventual Canada-wide reduction of \$32 billion by 1995. This ultimately puts a cap on all present and future implementations of health and education programs.

Education is the key to a more prosperous country, a more understanding country. I believe our education system in Ontario, along their other provincial counterparts, should join together in a co-operative spirit to eliminate ideological regionalism in the way we think about other parts of Canada. We learn the history of Upper and Lower Canada, a little bit about the Maritimes and even less about the west. Are not the histories of all provinces and their development a part of Canada's history? I did not, unfortunately, learn about other provinces until I came to university. What about those who do not have a post-secondary education?

I propose a simple solution that all provinces should attempt. In Ontario we have required courses of math, and English and others, but we should also require an additional four courses of history, telling about the history and future of (1) the Maritimes; (2) Ontario and Quebec; (3) the western provinces and territories, and finally, to join them all together, how they all fit into the milieu of Canada.

With the capping of health care services, it prevents Canada from continuing to be world leaders in areas of its expertise. This knowledge can not only be sold to other countries, but this knowledge also fulfils the Canadian citizen's right to life as guaranteed by the charter of rights. It is disheartening to have to send patients to American hospitals due to the simple fact that some beds are closed due to budgetary limitations.

Next in my submission, I would like to address the situation of the Canadian aboriginals and their want of self-government.

Most Canadians are ignorant to the plight of the native Indian and as a result have developed an incorrect stereotype. I too was guilty of that same mistake. I did not understand what they wanted. I too was outraged at how the native Indians at Oka could get away with a blockade of roads and bridges, how they could get away with holding the *sûreté du Québec* and the army at armed bay.

With some guidance from some key people, I was directed to information and sources so as to better understand what they indeed wanted. Hopefully I have the right idea, but only can speak as an observer and not on their behalf. So to them I apologize if I have misinterpreted or offended them.

1930

During the incident at Oka, a report by the RCMP stated that the Warrior Society that was behind the armed standoff was "a well-funded and equipped guerrilla force that posed a great danger to law enforcement and military forces. Warriors are feared by other Indians and will stop at nothing to enforce their law on reserves." I believed this at first, but on the other hand, have realized that to other Indians Oka symbolically represents the stress, inequities and alienation they suffer from. Something has to be done now to greatly improve their plight.

Time and time again, the native Indians have stated the fact that they want to be a part of Canada. None, to my knowledge, has ever stated that if their demands were never met, they would seek some sort of association, nor have they ever held a constitutional knife to the throat of Canada. They have patiently tried and waited to negotiate a better life for themselves. Their heritage adds to a Canadian uniqueness, and though I do not agree with the bearing of arms at Oka, I understand that it represents aboriginal frustrations.

Some people have refuted their claims to self-government by stating that if they cannot live in our system, how can they survive in their own? We have to realize that they have tried to live within our system, tried to live with our ideals and therefore are products of our values, not theirs. They have proven that they are better protectors of the ecology and have continued to strive and succeed to be an important part of Canada. I can see how their own system of government and their own system of justice could better address their needs. They certainly can do no worse than what has been done to them in the past.

Although I believe in having a strong central government, the provinces should seek and have exclusive jurisdiction over aboriginals. Their needs could be better addressed by dealing with one level of government instead of dealing with two. Transfer of such powers, however, should in no way interfere with provincial and federal existing programs. The reason the provinces should have jurisdiction is twofold: (1) the demands of each Indian band could be dealt with separately so as to meet any special needs that might arise and to prevent any conflicts among different bands and (2) many Indian claims involve land,

and since the province has jurisdiction over land, it would be better suited to look after this.

A good starting point would be to take a look at the Sechelt Indian Band Self-Government Act, which I believe was passed in Alberta, to see what lessons we learned from it and how we can improve on its foundation. I like the idea of a municipal structure with a native justice system, a system where they would operate their own services, such as school, fire and police. A group of individuals should help to set up the system under the guise of Indian leaders and help in the technical matters associated with it. This help should eventually be eliminated as aboriginals gain more experience and thus become better qualified. However, aboriginal rights should never supersede that of any other Canadian right, nor should any Canadian right supersede aboriginal ones.

The Chair: Mr Elliott, if you could sum up, we are near the end of the time.

Mr Elliott: We are sitting here today as a result of the failed Meech Lake accord, an agreement that in my opinion was fundamentally flawed. But that is in the past, and we have to look at the constitutional impasse that we are at today. I truly want Quebec to remain a part of Canada in the sense of all provinces being equal. I do not want to see them pursue sovereignty-association.

As a province, Quebec is a part of the Canadian uniqueness. As a province, Quebec is different from us with its heritage, culture and, of course, language. But other parts are also distinct. Herring Cove, Nova Scotia; Sussex, New Brunswick; Dauphin, Manitoba, all have distinct characteristics. Canada does not need Brockville idiots who stomp on the fleur-de-lis. To me, their ignorance only helps to foster ideological regionalism and Quebec's alienation.

But I must add, Quebec or any other province should not have a veto over constitutional matters. This gives the balance of power to one province over the other, and we would be back into the Meech Lake situation we once were and, Mr Chairman, you might be in the same position chairing another constitutional committee.

Some concern is raised with the emergence of groups that are coming forward and saying that they want their rights, or their rights should be guaranteed by the Constitution. It seems to me that the Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees all Canadians the same rights. The charter does not take away from any one group and in my opinion is a fundamentally sound protector of their rights. Section 27 preserves multicultural heritage and section 28 applies the charter to both men and women equally.

In conclusion, let me say that Ontario has to realize it is probably the only province that can truly play the role of conciliator effectively. Our own interests must be looked after but also the interests that benefit the country as a whole. Maybe a new parallel accord to the Constitution, a definite new set of talks, or perhaps ultimate failure of the country—whatever measures are taken, whatever is decided, it is important for the survival of Canada as a country to realize that we will eventually have to unite.

Meech Lake might not have been the answer to our constitutional impasse, but the supposed flaws of our Constitution must be overshadowed by our relatively young age. As a country we are a little over 100 years and, hopefully, we have more years to develop a truly Canadian identity. Let's stop Canada's intellectual civil war among the political élite and finally allow Quebec to patriate the Constitution and let Canada get on with its uniqueness.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Elliott. We will have to move on to the next speaker, I am afraid.

CHERYL LUCIER

Ms Lucier: Good evening. I would like to welcome all members of the select committee on Ontario in Confederation to Windsor. I am pleased with this opportunity to speak at a public hearing on a subject which concerns us all, that is, Confederation, our Constitution and our Charter of Rights. I applaud the government of Ontario for caring enough to ask our opinion. It is an important process in a democratic government as long as someone really wants to listen.

As you know, Windsor is one of the communities which has lost its local TV news station through CBC cutbacks. As well, our only local newspaper is owned by a large, syndicated corporation which effectively reduces the quality and quantity of our local news and often fails to reflect the view of Windsorites. We must take any available opportunity to make ourselves heard and to make our views known. The government of Canada has tried to muffle our cries of dissatisfaction but we will not be silenced. I am not alone when I say that I am not pleased with the state of our country. We in Windsor are not happy with the way the government has handled our affairs regarding the Constitution, free trade, the GST, the Gulf war and CBC and Via Rail cutbacks. We are ready for a change. It is time for a federal election.

Tonight I have come here to discuss the Constitution and the future of Canada. I have no answers. I have only my opinions to share with you. I believe we have begun the process of bringing Canada together in Confederation by being here tonight, by sharing our ideas, our interests, anxieties and hopes on Canadian unity and by listening to what others have to say.

I believe Canada needs a strong, intelligent and pro-Canadian leader to guide us through this constitutional crisis. In the next federal election the Constitution must be made a key issue and Canadians must choose a government that will deal with this problem in a reasonable manner. I believe we should take the time to create a new Canadian Constitution which includes our Charter of Rights; the rights of the poor, elderly and disabled; the rights of women and the rights of our aboriginal people.

Our new Constitution should have an amending procedure to deal with changes in political and economic thought. These changes are imminent, and also a clause to allow provinces to withdraw from Confederation. No business has ever existed with an unwilling partner. How can we expect a country to?

1940

Our new Canadian Senate should be an elected body of officials with a set term of office.

We must ensure that our national social programs are upheld and strengthened, including good health care, education, housing and pensions in a clean, safe environment. We must support the right of all Canadians to participate fully, without discrimination, in their communities, to accept government appointments, to have political and religious freedom, to demand equality of opportunity and equal protection under the law for all members of our community. We must strengthen the democratic decision-making process and we must oppose uncontrolled capitalism when the rights of individuals are threatened.

Brian Mulroney has approved the formation of a North American bloc economy through free trade with the US, and now Mexico. We all know that the main beneficiary of this deal is the United States. To protect Canadian interests, we must scrap the free trade deal. We must say no to a North American bloc economy, no to any economic association with the US unless it is to our benefit and on our terms. The future of Canada depends on it.

Is it naïve to think we can become an independent, self-supporting nation? I believe our economy can produce a good life for all Canadians and a secure future if our provinces are willing to co-operate under a democratic agreement. Canada is a nation rich in natural resources. Each province can boast of its own unique contributions to the economy of Canada and each province, not just Quebec, has special interests and needs. I believe it is the diversity of our Canadian provinces that will finally pull us back together. We must put into place a Canadian provinces economic confederation which will promote unrestricted and preferred trade between our provinces. The provinces will learn to use and share Canadian resources, products and services and our nation will no longer be threatened.

We must be willing to delegate power to our provinces to make our country more efficient and to control overspending by eliminating overlapping jurisdictions. We must trust our provincial leaders to be fully responsible in their assigned areas of duties and to report back to the federal government on these matters. This trust in each other is necessary to attain Canadian unity. I am an English-speaking French Canadian in Ontario. I have studied Canadian literature and history in an attempt to understand the English-French situation in Canada. I have also researched my family history in a personal search for my own identity. Perhaps this passage from the introduction of my work *The Lucier Family in Canada* will explain how I feel.

"My work was motivated by an interest in our French Canadian heritage. Our family has made its home in Canada for 12 generations, and although many of us no longer speak the French language, our culture and our way of life has been retained. Many things we do and say have been passed down over the generations. Our customs, foods, holidays all portray our origins, and yet we cannot remember that they are French customs, for we never knew France. They may seem to be Canadian customs, and so

they are, for France is a part of us and we are an important part of Canada.

"We have never been taught to consider the French against the English. Indeed, we have become English-speaking people. And yet somehow we are caught in the middle of this battle. The French-speaking Canadians call us *anglais* because we do not speak French, and yet our name proclaims us *français*. And so we must hold tightly to our heritage and be proud of it. We can at once be true Canadians and still be proud of our ancestors, for they helped make Canada a country where all families can live happily together. Some day all people in Canada may learn our 'other' official language and recognize our French culture. Until then we are left to struggle alone in the maintenance of our heritage."

The struggle I speak of is one that began over 200 years ago. The conquest might have caused the ethnic and religious disintegration of French Canada; it did not. This was due in part to French Canada's will to retain its language and to survive as a distinct cultural and political group. It was in fact the British who decided to be lenient in this regard. As early as 1774 the French were given full rights in Canada and the Constitutional Act of 1791 guaranteed the survival of French in Canada. Confederation in 1867 has been called the guardian of French Canadian identity.

This English-French agreement or understanding is an historic convention of our Constitution, a tradition of recognizing the rights of the other. Out of this tradition stems Canada's cultural mosaic, which embraces the liberty of non-English people to be themselves in a multicultural nation. History has given us a dual culture which is diverse in language and race. The French fact in Canada will remain as long as the will to survive does. Canada is a nation of diversity. Our strength is our tolerance of this diversity.

If we are to prevent Quebec from separating, we must first erase the threat of attempted assimilation through the anglicization of French Canadians. This threat does exist. If we are to be a truly bilingual country, then all Canadians should learn to speak both languages fluently. No one has ever lost by learning another language. It is our young generation which is capable of fulfilling our quest for a bilingual nation. I say take both languages seriously and take the time to learn them well. The future of Canada rests in your hands.

We must ask Quebecers what they expect to benefit from separation. We must bargain with them in good faith and try to reach an agreement. If we cannot, then perhaps we must let them leave. In any case we must certainly welcome Quebec to join Confederation now and in the future.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms Lucier. Let me say that in sharing some of your opinions with us you certainly have given us some of the answers, I think, that we are looking for. Are there any questions of Ms Lucier?

Mr Dadamo: I just wanted to ask you a real simple question. If it was you and I speaking at a table and there were not a lot of people watching throughout the province, what would you say to English-speaking citizens of this

province of Ontario to get them to embrace each other's culture, if you could say something from the heart?

Ms Lucier: I think it is important that we recognize the culture of all people in Canada, not just the French. We are a multicultural society and so far we have been open to this. We have a history of accepting other people. As far as English-speaking people and the French situation is concerned, I think they should first realize that there are French all across Canada and we are not going away, so you should learn to deal with us, because we are an important part of Canada.

RON WAGENBERG

Mr Wagenberg: My name is Ron Wagenberg, and I have taught Canadian government at the University of Windsor for 26 years. That perhaps is not what ordinary Canadians do. Let me say that I love Canada like an ordinary Canadian and I hope my comments will be taken just as much in that context as of someone who is a student of Canadian government.

Let me say parenthetically before I start what I have written that what I intend to say has something to do with the kind of perspective I would like Ontario to have in negotiating the changes in Canada. I am concerned, quite frankly, with this whole idea of a new Canada, because it tends to intimate there is something wrong with the old Canada.

I want to say something on behalf of the Canada we have today. Canada, as we know it today, is not a failure. In negotiating our future to say that everything outside of Canada really is only contingent upon and dependent upon our relationship with Quebec, I think is to take the wrong perspective. It is to take a weak perspective. As a matter of fact it is to invite Quebecers to leave, because what is there to stay with?

Let me couch all of this in terms of the perspective you have to take in terms of looking at our future, and it is a perspective that I think has to take a certain amount of confidence in what we have become and what we are and what we constituted ourselves to be and what we achieved, and I think one can argue that far from being a failure, this country represents a tremendous success.

1950

Canada, as it presently exists with all its imperfections, constitutional and otherwise, represents one of the most successful political systems ever developed. This can be asserted on the basis of most of the criteria by which political systems are judged.

Is there social peace and respect for public order? Yes, there is. Are there individual rights and freedoms and institutions to protect and expand these rights and freedoms? Yes, there are. Are there democratic institutions and opportunities to exercise democratic rights? Yes, there are. Is there an economic system which has produced widespread, if not equally shared prosperity for Canadians? Yes, there is. Are there policies, even with constitutional recognition, that seek to redistribute wealth so that the poorer regions can have social programs they might otherwise have in lesser measure? Yes, there are. Has the federal system allowed the provinces to retain their unique identities? Without

a doubt, and Quebec has succeeded and prospered within the Canadian federal state in a way it never would have in some other political system.

Should we dismantle the arrangements which have produced these results? Absolutely not. Now this is not to argue we cannot make improvements, perhaps major ones, to our political systems. These refinements, however, need not necessarily be constitutional ones, and a lot of the things that people have said to you today are truly problems of major proportions, but they are policy problems that can be settled within the context of what powers the provincial government of Ontario already exercises and the powers the federal government has to exercise. So Canadians who are disillusioned by government generally today, perhaps especially because of policies like the goods and services tax of the present federal government, have blamed institutions which have up till now produced many of the benefits of Canadian life. Both at the federal and provincial levels, Canadians can change policies by changing governments.

I might just say parenthetically that the constitutional position of British Columbia is going to change drastically if the next Premier of British Columbia is Mr Harcourt rather than Mr Vander Zalm. I think we will have less of what was referred to before as "shopping plaza federalism." We will have a more nationalist point of view rather than a provincialist one, I would think.

Canadians need not usually look for constitutional solutions to their problems. Constitutional reforms, for instance an overhaul of the Senate, may be long overdue, but they are no guarantee of better government or of universally popular policies.

Without discounting the legitimate constitutional concerns of the aboriginal peoples and the long-standing sense of grievance of many western Canadians, it is clear that the present constitutional debate is generated by a concern to keep Quebec within the Canadian state. It is something we should try to do. I want Quebec to remain within our federal system. I want that because it benefits Canadians generally and because it is in the interests of the great mass of the Quebec population, but I do not want it at the cost of dismantling the institutions that have been basic to the success of this country.

Canadians would be foolish to even discuss the Allaire report recommendations, which would make of Quebec an independent country while it retained a claim on the financial resources of Canada. It is nowhere to start the negotiations. If I can use perhaps a union-type of analogy, it is like walking into negotiations saying, "As long as you don't call for our decertification, we'll talk about anything else." I mean, that would be ludicrous and nobody would even envision it for a moment, and yet that is the constitutional groundwork that we are being asked to accept outside of Quebec. The report is calling for a sovereign Quebec with institutionalized foreign aid from Canada. That is what the Allaire report is about. It should be rejected even as a negotiating document, as should the presumptuous deadlines it imposes upon the rest of the country. They should be ignored.

We in Ontario and other parts of Canada should stop the discussion of our Constitution, the Constitution of all of us, on Quebec's terms, on Quebec's timetable and for reasons that have never been justified in any concrete way. We can never satisfy the nationalist emotions of a minority of Quebecers. We can by a rational discussion, if we will be allowed one, demonstrate how Quebec prospers from Canada.

These ideas might appear to be unduly confrontative. I would argue that Canadians, including those who live in Quebec, are at the point where we must confront reality. The reality is that Canada does not represent a failed federal system that needs to be radically restructured. The reality is that Canadians outside Quebec have a strong sense of themselves as Canadians who are both the authors and the beneficiaries of the achievements of this country. I do not agree with the view that says Canada will fall apart piecemeal if one of our 10 provinces leaves. I believe there is more than a little bit of Canadian feeling, of Canadian identity in the other provinces and we cannot always box ourselves into a negotiating position which says, "If Quebec leaves, the sky falls." We do not want Quebec to leave, yet at the same time we cannot put ourselves in a position where we can be threatened, and that is no way to negotiate.

Canadians may not be able to always articulate some grandiose sense of purpose but they really have no need, any more than Norwegians or New Zealanders or Peruvians or Mexicans have to get up in the morning and say, "I am a Mexican because," you know, this, that and the other thing. Canadians for some reason have been convinced we need to. We do not. We understand we are Canadians. The overwhelming majority of us know we are Canadians and we have to proceed on that basis. So your first set of questions about what are common values, forget about that. Move on to what is in our Constitution that we can usefully change.

The idea that Canada today is only viable in the historical context of English-French relations is no longer true. We have moved beyond that. A Canada which includes Quebec must always accommodate that historic relation in a way that does not threaten the French minority, and we should continue to seek reasonable constitutional arrangements for both sides. A Canada without Quebec will still be a bilingual Canada because it will include New Brunswick, our only bilingual province, and it will include the large francophone population of Ontario whose historic rights must be guaranteed.

But Canada, while diminished, will, however, continue to be not just a viable but a successful political enterprise in the absence of Quebec and we must negotiate our future with that confidence. Canada would remain the eighth largest country in the world, by the way, without Quebec, and we would still have three quarters of our population. We have got to stop talking about "the rest of Canada" as if that were some kind of minority. There is a country called Canada, part of which is Quebec.

It is not for Quebec to give Canada one last chance. Canadian citizenship is a privilege, one that countless millions outside our borders would dearly love to have. Quebec nationalism has led many Quebecers to discount the

value of Canadian citizenship. If attachment to their unquestionably distinct society means they cannot accept a government in Ottawa with the capacity to make law for them, then that is the choice of Quebecers to make. It is only one more testament to the strength and decency of our country that their choice can be made without resorting to violence. That is not the case in other places.

The people of Quebec, however, cannot expect Canadians outside that province to remake the Constitution to accommodate what is in essence a rejection of the Canadian community. Quebecers must confront the reality that the rejection of membership in the Canadian community must mean the forfeiture of the benefits of Canadian citizenship. The time has come for Quebecers to choose, because the Canadian political system cannot continue to constantly debate the question of who will be in and who will be out of that system.

The people of Quebec should be allowed to make their decision in a referendum that is conducted by the government of Canada, in my opinion, with a simple unambiguous question such as, "Do you wish to remain a Canadian citizen?" I believe the answer to that question would be yes. I also believe at the present time that if they were asked about sovereignty on the same ballot, they would say yes to that. There is a lot of confusion in Quebec about the meanings of these words.

I am relatively certain that the average Quebecer does not understand that the proposals being made today entail the giving up of Canadian citizenship. That is something that most Quebecers, a majority of Quebecers, I think, still want to retain and value. To remind Quebecers of those costs, the costs of leaving Canada, is not to engage in threats, as some have alleged. It is simply to have Quebecers be mindful of reality.

2000

For instance, it must be clear that over \$3 billion in equalization payments will no longer be available to Quebec and that will have to be reflected in higher taxes or diminished services. Those who work on servicing the CF-18s of Canada's air force, as Premier Pawley has referred to, must realize that we would not allow that work to continue in a foreign country. It must be obvious that Canada's space agency would have to be moved from Quebec to Canada. Policies which protect and encourage industries which are centred in Quebec that involve subsidies by Canadian taxpayers or higher prices for Canadian consumers would likely be terminated. More generally, economic relationships which are now governed under the circumstances of common citizenship, which encourages attempts to redress regional economic disparity, would later be conducted according to the less generous dictates of national interest.

Quebecers may accept these costs as reasonable ones for the benefit of independence, but certainly someone should point out that there are those costs because their leaders have refused to discuss them. I hope I am not being too cynical if I speculate that those who have the most to gain from Quebec independence have hidden the costs from those, the great majority, who have the most to lose.

What changes should be made to the Constitution? Before addressing that question we must have a grasp of which of our problems are truly the result of an inadequate or inappropriate constitutional structure, and which are simply the product of contemporary political, economic and social circumstances.

For instance, it does not follow that because we do not like the GST we should advocate a constitutional change in the federal government's power to tax. Surely we will have the sense to look at some fundamental principles when we discuss the division of powers between the federal and provincial legislatures.

That seems to be the fulcrum of the discussion, the division of powers, although I think one can look at the constitution more generally to find all kinds of things we might want to reform for the 21st century.

The simplest but most important question that must be answered in the distribution of powers is whether the federal or provincial government can best deliver service to the citizens of Canada resident in their various provinces. Obviously there can be major disagreements on this question. The answer must be tempered by an assessment of whether the exercise of a power by a province has the potential to affect negatively other provinces or whether federal control is necessary to have a desired uniformity in policy. Obviously questions to do with the environment have that kind of quality to them.

Without getting into a detailed assessment of the various powers in sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution Act, 1867, which would be inappropriate, I think, in this submission, I would argue that, generally, average people in the various provinces of Canada have little to gain and perhaps a lot to lose by the transference of powers from the federal government. More particularly, disadvantaged provinces and poor citizens in all provinces are the most likely to suffer from such a transfer. What else is new?

To those who complain about the remoteness of Ottawa from much of Canada, I would respond that Toronto often seems remote from Windsor and Sudbury, that Halifax is remote from Cape Breton, Quebec City from the Gaspé, Flin Flon from Winnipeg, and so on. I doubt as well that the clients of Ontario's Workers' Compensation Board are significantly more satisfied with their relationship with that provincial agency than are the clients of the federal Unemployment Insurance Commission. It is also unlikely that residents of any province love their provincial tax collectors any more than they do Revenue Canada.

The spending power of the federal government should be maintained. Without it, the prospect of nationally uniform social programs will suffer. The universality of medicare, for instance, would have been seriously eroded by now if not for the Canada Health Act, a good example of federal interference in the provincial jurisdiction through the spending power, and good on that, good on that interference.

The Chair: Mr Wagenberg, perhaps you could summarize, please.

Mr Wagenberg: I will make it quick. When one looks at the 29 powers assigned to the federal Parliament in section 91, one is hard put to see where the transference of

any of these powers to the provinces would lead to a better life for the residents of those provinces. None the less, a variety of powers which have developed in response to modern technology such as communications might be the subject of some better definition and joint responsibility.

The federal powers of reservation and disallowance have outlived their usefulness as has the federal role in education which appears in section 93. However, many residents of Ontario might well expect at least a thorough debate about the continued appropriateness of constitutional guarantees for denominational education in section 93, if you are going to talk about the Constitution.

One change that is necessary—perhaps I should have said this first because I think it is most important—should be number one on the agenda for constitutional change, the necessary one which will establish an acceptable constitutional status and basis for self-government for Canada's aboriginal people. I would not presume to even hint at what the outlines of these provisions would be, but I do feel that they must be an integral part of the next constitutional discussions, nothing to be put off any longer.

The reform of the Senate is a popular subject and must be obviously addressed, especially from the standpoint of the western and Atlantic provinces. Ontario, however, has to keep in mind that a fundamental objective of Senate reform is to dilute the influence of the large population of this province at the national level. That is its aim.

Thus, while we must be prepared to compromise in order to address the concerns of the smaller provinces, we must be wary of the powers of a Senate in which we might have 10% of the members as opposed to the House of Commons where we now have a third or more of the members as opposed to the House of Commons where we now have a third or more of the members. And while we are looking at the Senate, why should we not at least consider whether we can improve on our way of electing members of Parliament?

In summing up, I would hope that Ontario's constitutional position will be based on preserving a viable economic union which has the capacity to redistribute wealth to the less prosperous regions of Canada and to disadvantaged people in this country. One may hope that eventually redistributive policies will lead to smaller disparities in the economic conditions of Canadians. In addition, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms should continue to be the centrepiece of our constitutional life. Finally, we should put our constitutional discussions behind us and concentrate on solving the problems of this country through political debate rather than the restatement of ancient grievances. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr Wagenberg. We are going to move on to the next speaker.

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE-FRANÇAISE DE L'ONTARIO

The Chair: I invite Marcel Bergeron, de l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario.

M. Bergeron : Merci. Mon nom est Marcel Bergeron et je représente l'Association canadienne-française de Windsor et Essex-Kent. J'habite la région de Windsor depuis

déjà la moitié de ma vie ; l'autre moitié, je suis natif du Québec. Au début je pensais que j'étais chez nous en Ontario. Par la suite, lorsque je suis rentré sur le marché du travail dans une grosse industrie, je me suis aperçu que je n'étais pas vraiment chez nous en Ontario. Je pensais que j'étais un Canadien, mais on me disait souvent : «Retourne-toé z'en au Québec. T'es un Québécois».

Je vais commencer mon mémoire. Nous vous remercions de l'opportunité de participer aux audiences en vue de déterminer le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération dans le débat sur l'avenir du Canada.

L'ACFO de Windsor et Essex-Kent est un organisme qui informe et développe la communauté francophone de la région de Windsor, Essex et Kent. Selon le dernier recensement, ceci représente un nombre total de membres d'environ 30 000 personnes. Nous avons près de 900 membres actifs.

La région de Windsor est le site d'habitation continue le plus ancien en Ontario. L'origine de notre région remonte à l'époque du régime français. Il y a 290 ans, en 1711, Antoine Laumet, Sieur de Lamothe-Cadillac, partait de Montréal pour venir s'établir avec 100 hommes à une colonie agricole en vue d'assurer la permanence de l'établissement. À l'automne de la même année, son épouse venait le rejoindre pour y établir son domicile.

Bien que nous reconnaissons au Québec le droit de décider sa destinée, nous appuyons sans réserve tous les efforts en vue d'assurer une place au Québec au sein du Canada. Nous sommes convaincus que la province de Québec dans la Confédération est avantageuse pour tout le Canada. De plus, nous croyons que les faits historiques indiquent que l'Ontario est la province la mieux placée pour prendre le leadership dans ces décisions. Advenant l'échec d'une entente entre le Québec et le Canada anglais, nous souhaitons que l'Ontario respecte la décision du Québec et maintienne des relations harmonieuses sur les plans économique et culturel.

Nous réalisons que ces audiences ont été établies dans le but d'obtenir l'opinion sur la façon dont nous pouvons améliorer le Canada. Les points soulevés vont des valeurs canadiennes à ce que veut l'Ontario. Comme représentants de la communauté francophone, nous limiterons nos commentaires aux chapitres qui nous concernent le plus.

2010

Nous nous croyons un peuple qui respecte l'individu et son droit de vivre avec dignité. Malheureusement, il y a beaucoup trop d'intolérance envers les groupes minoritaires. Par exemple, une grande différence entre les États-Unis et le Canada est le fait que nous sommes un pays bilingue et multiculturel. Mais en pratique, il y a plusieurs provinces où le bilinguisme est carrément rejeté et où le multiculturalisme est synonyme de folklore. Trop de gens semblent croire que les besoins des uns sont satisfaits au détriment des autres.

L'approche est compétitive plutôt que collaboratrice, lorsqu'en réalité nous pouvons toujours gagner en appuyant tous et chacun à s'actualiser. Si nous voulons vraiment permettre à tous les citoyens du Canada de vivre avec dignité, il est impératif que nous reconnaissions les besoins des groupes minoritaires. Il faut focaliser sur les

besoins plutôt que sur les droits si l'on veut garantir la justice aux groupes minoritaires, tels que les autochtones, les francophones, les femmes, les immigrants et les réfugiés.

Quels devraient être les rôles respectifs des gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux ? Si la situation idéale est peut-être un gouvernement central fort, toutefois, tant et aussi longtemps que certaines provinces refuseront d'entendre ce que dit le Québec, l'idée d'un gouvernement central fort est vouée à l'échec. Il faut reconnaître que le système démocratique est un fort beau système pour la majorité. C'est pourquoi, si la volonté de la majorité est le seul facteur influençant des décisions canadiennes, il ne faudra pas être surpris que le Québec veuille se transformer en majorité en se dissociant des neuf autres provinces.

Nous devons faire partie des prises de décision qui nous affectent et obtenir les services qui répondent à nos besoins. Pour les francophones qui vivent dans les régions désignées, la Loi sur les services en français est une façon très tangible de reconnaître l'apport au patrimoine culturel de la population francophone et le désir de le sauvegarder pour les générations à venir.

Nous félicitons le gouvernement ontarien qui a fait preuve de leadership en adoptant la Loi sur les services en français. Nous avons les yeux tournés vers l'avenir dans l'espoir d'obtenir les services qui répondent à nos besoins, tels que les soins de santé en français et un système d'éducation géré par les francophones, des garderies aux collèges communautaires et à l'université en passant par les écoles primaires et secondaires. C'est ce que nous n'avons pas encore en Ontario, des collèges communautaires et une université.

Les Canadiens aiment se croire tolérants. Malheureusement, cela n'est pas toujours le cas. Par conséquent, les gouvernements doivent assurer le leadership en prenant les décisions qui répondent aux besoins de leurs citoyens, surtout lorsque ceux-ci sont en minorité. Les gouvernements doivent aussi jouer un rôle d'éducateurs et sensibiliser la population majoritaire aux besoins des minorités.

Il est encourageant de voir que de façon générale, les Ontariens bien renseignés sur l'histoire du Canada reconnaissent que la Loi sur les services en français est favorable à la culture et à l'identité canadiennes. Les principes qui devraient guider les actions du gouvernement doivent être le respect de l'individu, la tolérance et la justice plutôt que simplement le gouvernement par la majorité.

Les gouvernements provinciaux devraient voir aux intérêts de leurs citoyens. Le gouvernement fédéral devrait veiller sur la situation des groupes minoritaires, c'est-à-dire les anglophones au Québec et les francophones dans les provinces anglaises.

Historiquement, l'Ontario est la province qui a le plus de liens avec le Québec. L'Ontario a été partenaire avec le Québec depuis avant la Confédération. Géographiquement, nous sommes reliés par une très grande frontière. L'Ontario a des liens sur les plans de la géographie et du commerce. Quelle que soit la décision à laquelle les citoyens du Québec arriveront, nous croyons qu'il est très avantageux pour l'Ontario de maintenir ces liens qui existent depuis 300 ans.

De plus, nous voulons souligner que les débats à venir ont le potentiel de tourner la discussion en francophones versus anglophones. Advenant la séparation du Québec, il est fort possible que le sentiment populaire soit de ne pas reconnaître les francophones hors Québec. Or, les Franco-Ontariens ne sont pas des Québécois hors Québec mais bel et bien des Ontariens qui sont venus s'établir ici en 1701. Il serait tragique que ce peuple fondateur devienne le bouc émissaire pour les sentiments anti-French qui existent chez certains Ontariens.

Nous croyons fermement que l'Ontario peut jouer un rôle central dans le débat à venir. L'Ontario, grâce à sa longue association avec le Québec et son engagement envers sa propre population francophone, a probablement le plus de crédibilité auprès du peuple québécois. Cette réputation peut être rehaussée par l'engagement continu du gouvernement de l'Ontario à offrir des services en français à sa population.

M. Winninger : Il me semble que vous avez accepté l'idée de la séparation du Québec. Je me demande si vous désirez maintenir quelques relations entre l'Ontario et le reste du Canada ? Je me demande s'il y a seulement des relations économiques ou s'il y a d'autres relations.

M. Bergeron : Si je comprends bien la question, non, je ne me suis pas prononcé pour dire que le Québec se séparerait, mais ça peut être le cas. Par contre, je suis persuadé que les relations entre les autres provinces vont être de mise si toutefois le Québec se sépare du Canada pour renforcer tous les francophones à travers le reste du Canada.

Mr Offer : Mr Bergeron, thank you for your presentation. At the end of your presentation, you alluded to the concern you had about Franco-Ontarian rights in the event that Quebec separated, or something less than with the rest of Canada. You expressed a concern as to the impact that may have, but then you went on and stated—I think this point has been made before, and I think it is important—that the rights of Franco-Ontarians are not derived or do not gain any strength from Quebec but rather are something inherently found in Ontario. I am wondering if you can share with us your sense of what the role of Ontario might be in order to address the interests of Franco-Ontarians in the event that there was a different relationship between Quebec and the rest of Canada.

NM. Bergeron : Il sera vraiment très difficile pour la population francophone de l'Ontario de promouvoir, de former et d'informer la population en général si on n'a pas l'aide du gouvernement. Alors, si nous les francophones voulons conserver notre patrimoine et notre héritage, il faudrait doubler d'ardeur en ce qui a trait à l'éducation, en ce qui a trait à tous les services auxquels on a droit en Ontario ou au Canada en tant que citoyens entiers.

2020

TRADITIONAL TEACHING CIRCLE INC

The Vice-Chair : We call next the Traditional Teaching Circle, Ernestine Trudeau and Joyce Vachon.

Ms Trudeau : Joyce and I represent a few of the Ojibway-speaking women in our community. We learned

about this meeting late last night, so we did not have very much time to prepare a lot of issues and concerns we have that need to be addressed.

When the vote was given to the Indian people back in the 1950s, I participated at that time in bringing the vote to our native people. I have watched since that time the progress the nation is making, and also the role the Indian people play in achieving their rightful place in society.

Lately, we have seen the erosion of our family life. Our young people face despair, especially our women and our children. We notice this in our family life, so as women we have come together and have asked ourselves some very serious questions. Those questions are: What are we doing as women, as nurturers, as mothers, to help shape the future of our country? Because it is an erosion of values that I see going down the drain.

So we decided to restore our teachings, our traditional values that were once part of our upbringing, I remember, in our language, our mothers and fathers and our grandparents, the extended family, and they would teach to us these things. We had 21 precepts to live by. I also heard my father and grandfathers talk about these value systems that had been passed on to them, and they included the value systems of their religion, as such. But we look at it today and it is not there any more. So we have asked ourselves: What can we do? We who can remember these teachings want to instill them back into our society, into the Indian society.

When we heard about this committee that was meeting here tonight, we had been talking previously in the months past about what we would be presenting to the people in this community and to other Indian people elsewhere and maybe to women in general—actually this pertains to everybody in Canada. We all seem to share the same values, almost. We had a way of life that took care of all our needs. We had survived throughout the centuries without assimilation. Our teachings, culture, values and beliefs were taken away from us through assimilation and the Indian Act and replaced by European colonialism. This has caused many problems in our society. We had a shared community. We did not separate church and state; justice and values were combined. Spirituality existed in our daily lives and was recognized in everything around us, including the planet that we live on.

Aboriginal peoples played a very important role in the founding of this nation. If the first nation people had not welcomed the strangers on these shores, there would not have been a treaty between our nation and the Queen and the British government. In order to be ethical about acquiring land from aboriginals, the treaties were entered into in exchange for certain provisions, such as education, health, welfare and the right to govern ourselves. This was the basis on which our economic base was established.

We were also instrumental in the military for the British North America Act to follow. The British North America Act, which is Canada's Constitution, assigned to the federal government responsibility for aboriginal nations. Our rights are entrenched in the Constitution. Only an amendment in the Constitution could change that situation. Under the federal government, colonization took place. That

means the Indians were going to be civilized. Churches and schools were under government jurisdiction; therefore they became a mechanism for social control.

It is up to the federal government to recognize what it has created. They have created an illusion. Even though the bill of rights is under the Justice department, it does not apply to the Indian people because we have no right to self-determination or to enjoy the same freedoms as mainstream society. We have a unilateral system of colonialism which has created isolation by placing Indians on reserves throughout Canada. Therefore we have to recognize that there are two legal systems, one for the government of Canada and one for the Indians. There is no meaningful contact with the institutional structure, so we have become victims of the circumstances that this system creates.

The reason why I would like to pick the subject on justice and how it plays a role in our society, especially in the Indian society, is that there has been a very alarming amount of violence throughout the ages, as far as I can remember. You know, violence has been a part of a way of life for our Indian people, violence in the form of hunger. Hunger is violence. To be disadvantaged is violence. And not to be able to take part in the vote, even before it was given, that was a form of violence, because we were voiceless.

2030

Violence has speeded up somewhat in these last years. Just look at the statistics. Our jails are full of native people. There have been recent hangings of women in the Kingston penitentiary. They have no future; therefore they decided to take this step. Something is wrong with the system. Even though the bill of rights is under the Justice department, it just does not seem to apply to us, because when you go through the normal channels to be represented even in a case of character assassination, you have to have \$10,000 in your hand to be represented. I witnessed this a week ago.

I accompanied a woman whose rights have been violated, and the lawyer required \$10,000 to represent her. We had high hopes that we were going to be represented, and when we walked out of there we were very disillusioned because we said we cannot ever be represented. Our character assassinations take place and we cannot have a place for redress. We came to recognize that there are two legal systems, one for the government of Canada and one for the Indian people.

At the sociological and psychological levels we responded negatively to the situations created by that system. We have problems within our own community created by our own actions due to learned behaviour or not understanding the laws of the system—mainly not understanding the laws of the system. Sometimes these crimes that are committed, they are petty. It could be because we did not have proper representation or we were not educated as to what the laws are there, but our people do not understand the institutional structure.

As a result of all this, it filters right down to the lives of everybody, right down to the disadvantaged. We feel inferior and we feel disadvantaged because we have experienced violence and we respond violently out of anger and frustration. Our behaviour as a minority becomes very visible in

the eyes of the dominant society. There is the stereotype, there is a stereotyping, "Well, you know, what did you expect?" That is the way sometimes people respond or the dominant society responds. Our negative actions become more visible than those same actions in the dominant society.

Most of the crimes are committed impulsively and are alcohol related, and this phenomenon is more prevalent in and near the urban areas. Statistics are lower in rural or isolated reserves, but generally across Canada statistics show that our jails are filled with an unacceptably high level of native people.

Indian people know what they want and what their needs are. We need to replace the dominant value system with the traditional value system that we once lived by. We have to stop this colonialistic attitude, this unilateral structure under which we are governed. We have to replace it with self-determination and bring back our traditional teachings so that feelings of self-esteem, self-worth will once again manifest in each and every one of us. And then we will truly have truth and justice. This can only be accomplished by changing the legal system and the system by which the Indians are governed.

As I studied the way that the system came to be, I made out a chart so that I could see where I fit in. Under the justice system, under the federal government, there is a direct relationship, there is a direct jurisdiction of Indians, very separate, and the Indian Act follows. We are governed by this act. Under this act are reserves all over Canada, but very isolated, very apart from mainstream society. We do not understand the structure of institutions.

Now, in the province of Ontario, under the provincial government, we have our education, our health, our local governments and our welfare. We, as native women, have come to the conclusion that we need to work right at the base, and that is our families and that is restoring these values that we once had and we still have. Some families, you know, still maintain these values, this value system.

So our recommendation from the women is to restore our teachings, restore that we are a nation, that we have languages. We have five major linguistic groups in Canada, throughout North America really, but within my nation there are 31 different dialects. We have to be recognized for that linguistic difference, and we do live by that language because in that language lies our value system. I would like to see language at the education level, in the schools, and also a policy paper by Indian people at the provincial level and input from groups like the women's group that we are establishing here in Windsor. It is a new group, an emerging women's group, that will teach traditional teachings, and that includes not only Indian women. We are including all women.

The Vice-Chair: There are a few minutes left. I will leave it up to you. You can either sum up what you have to say or take questions. There are a few people who had questions.

Ms Trudeau: Okay. We will take questions.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Ms Trudeau, thank you so much for coming. We have had native women present to us in Sault Ste Marie, in Thunder Bay and Sioux Lookout, and I guess

I would compare your presentation most to the one we had in Sioux Lookout. You used the word "nurturing," you talked a lot about family values and you talked about spirituality, and I think it is very important that people hear the role of mothers and that this is expressed as articulately as you have done that tonight.

You have come to us with great sincerity and I know that you want us to be able to really hear your message. You did talk about a policy paper at the provincial level that would help you, that you are thinking of, and I guess that is your answer. I presume it is your answer to what approach should be followed to ensure that the needs of aboriginal peoples in Ontario and Canada are addressed effectively. That is one answer. Could you say a little bit more to us about the kind of policy paper, the things you think need to be in such a policy paper that we as provincial legislators could help you with?

2040

Ms Trudeau: We were thinking more in terms of dialogue at the level of all the reserves that are in Ontario by establishing the purpose of our organization, and going and talking with the women of each reserve and finding out what their concerns are. After all, you know, people seem to think that the law of the reserves lies with the men. It is really the women, at home, who help establish these laws.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: On short notice you have made a very, very significant presentation. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: We have time for about one very quick question. Mrs—Ms Churley, excuse me.

Ms Churley: He did it again.

Thank you for being here and thank you for doing what you are doing. Because I have been told I have to be quick, I will be. Have you noticed a difference yet, now that you are starting to get back into your traditional values, in the young people? Because of course that is where it lies now, now that young people are beginning to realize that in fact they can be proud of their culture and their traditions. I am wondering if you are seeing a change among the young because they are getting back to the basic values.

Ms Trudeau: Well, we need to get to the schools. This is where we are going to see that. We see that in our immediate families also. The women who embrace these values, we see this change taking place, but only in the teachings of traditional values.

Ms Churley: I would love to come to visit in one of your women's groups one day, so I will be in touch with you—

Ms Trudeau: All right, fine. We would be glad to have you.

Ms Churley: —if I am welcome to come.

Ms Trudeau: Yes, yes, more than welcome to come. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much for the presentation.

ASSOCIATION DES ENSEIGNANTES ET DES ENSEIGNANTS FRANCO-ONTARIENS

Le Vice-Président : Le comité aimerait appeler présentement l'Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, Lise Roy. We are calling the Franco-Ontarian teachers' association, Lise Roy.

Mme Roy : Bonsoir. Je tiens à remercier la commission d'avoir accepté d'entendre la présentation des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens, unité cycle secondaire, sur le rôle de l'Ontario à l'intérieur du Canada.

Notre unité regroupe 61 enseignantes et enseignants francophones, au niveau secondaire, originaires de différents pays et de différentes provinces du Canada.

Je crois que la plupart des Canadiens sont vraiment mêlés maintenant à savoir comment définir le Canada d'après-Meech. Trois choses principales nous sont communes traditionnellement :

La grandeur et la diversité du pays ; toute cette richesse nous appartient à tous. Que j'aie en Colombie britannique ou à Terre-Neuve, c'est mon pays.

Le respect de la différence ; la mosaïque canadienne, on en a beaucoup parlé et les gens sont fiers d'appartenir à un pays qui accepte que l'autre soit différent.

L'amour de la paix ; nous avons eu des hommes qui ont été reconnus internationalement au niveau d'être ambassadeurs de paix, comme Pearson et Trudeau. Notre passé n'est pas colonialiste, donc nous sommes perçus à l'extérieur comme acceptant les gens tels qu'ils sont sans essayer de les changer. Il y a aussi le respect de la non-violence. Nous avons une loi anti-armes à feu au Canada dont nous sommes très fiers.

Comment pouvons-nous assurer notre avenir au sein de l'économie mondiale ? Première réaction : essayons de vendre à l'étranger nos ressources naturelles ; transformons-les et vendons-les comme produits finis.

Encourageons l'achat au Canada ; étant si proche des frontières, c'est un point qui nous tient particulièrement à cœur. Des ajustements doivent être faits quant à ce qu'on veut faire de notre économie et quant aux prix des produits. À titre d'exemple, à mesure qu'on s'éloigne de Windsor, le prix du pétrole augmente assez rapidement. Alors, il y aurait des ajustements à faire.

Il serait important que le monde de l'industrie et celui de l'éducation se rapprochent et s'entendent pour développer une main-d'œuvre spécialisée qu'on doit en ce moment importer. Notre industrie s'en va de plus en plus vers une industrie de services où les salaires sont bas et où il n'y a pas d'avenir. Alors, il serait important qu'on forme notre jeunesse pour qu'elle soit capable d'avoir des emplois beaucoup plus spécialisés et que l'industrie et le domaine de l'éducation s'entendent pour les former.

Développons aussi l'entrepreneuriat dans toutes les provinces. Le Québec est en bonne voie. L'Ontario a un talon d'Achille qui est sa trop grande dépendance de l'industrie de l'automobile ; elle a besoin de diversifier. Dans les provinces de l'Atlantique les quotas de pêche empêchent nos concitoyens de gagner leur vie honorablement, tandis que des étrangers avec leurs bateaux-usines épuisent les ressources maritimes. Alors, là aussi on a beaucoup

besoin de diversifier et d'encourager les gens à se prendre en main et à bâtir eux-mêmes leur avenir.

Les disparités économiques sont tellement grandes au Canada que bien que les buts économiques soient semblables, certaines provinces se sont montrées trop faibles pour les atteindre ; c'est pourquoi le système de péréquation existe. Ce système a l'inconvénient de maintenir les provinces les plus pauvres dans une pauvreté tandis que les provinces plus riches paient la facture, et la fierté nationale en prend pour son rhume. J'aimerais peut-être élaborer un peu là-dessus s'il reste du temps après.

À la base, notre pays est un pays socialiste, ce qui n'est pas mal en soi. Cependant, nous aurions peut-être intérêt à aller voir en Europe comment certains pays socialistes ont quand même développé une économie forte. Nous pensons aux pays scandinaves entre autres.

Le véritable moteur économique du Canada est traditionnellement l'Ontario. De par sa situation géographique, notre province se trouve au cœur même de l'Amérique industrielle. Le Québec a développé dans les derniers 20 ans sa propre économie. La montée de l'entrepreneurship, une vision différente du monde des affaires et sa différence linguistique l'ont amené à se créer une ouverture sur le monde européen et américain.

La Colombie britannique a de plus en plus de contact avec l'Asie. Les provinces des Prairies ont des ouvertures en Union soviétique. Quelle combinaison gagnante pour une ouverture sur le monde. Tout est en place, le Canada se doit d'encourager les initiatives des provinces, de mettre en place une politique monétaire qui encourage le développement économique et de développer une fierté d'être Canadien, d'acheter canadien et de vivre en Canadien.

Qu'il me soit permise ici de faire une parenthèse. Depuis les coupures à Radio-Canada, l'image que les Canadiens de notre région reçoivent d'eux-mêmes leur est fournie par les informations américaines, donc, beaucoup filtrées. Comment voulez-vous développer une fierté nationale à travers ça ?

Quel rôle devraient jouer les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux ? Idéalement, les gouvernements devraient être des catalyseurs, c'est-à-dire, des gens responsables qui font arriver les choses pour le bien-être de tous. Dans les faits en ce moment, chacun tire la couverture de son bord. Nous avons eu un premier ministre qui était très centralisateur ; maintenant les provinces cherchent le pouvoir décentralisé. Qu'arrivera-t-il ? Meech a quand même donné la chance à toutes les provinces de se prononcer sur leur vision du Canada. Toutes les provinces ont été sensibilisées à ce qui se passe dans le pays. On a pris conscience les uns des autres, on a réfléchi. Il nous reste à accepter nos disparités et à les considérer comme des forces plutôt que des agents de division et à nous en servir dans le respect les uns des autres. Pour avoir un Canada uni, nous avons besoin d'une vision commune émanant d'un gouvernement central suffisamment fort pour maintenir une telle vision.

Si nous devons réécrire la constitution, nous devons considérer trois communautés nationales : les autochtones, les francophones, les anglophones. Une des premières règles que j'ai apprises en négociation est la suivante : ne

négochiez jamais avec un étranger. Afin de pouvoir négocier, les trois communautés nationales auraient intérêt à mieux se connaître. Preuve en a été faite à Oka. Les gouvernements canadien et québécois ne savaient même pas à qui s'adresser pour négocier.

2050

Pour être juste envers les autochtones, il faudrait d'abord apprendre à les connaître, à connaître leurs façons d'être, leurs structures gouvernementales et ensuite aller voir ce qu'ils veulent, comment ils voient, eux, la façon dont ils veulent fonctionner. On doit répondre d'abord à leurs besoins primaires, reconnaître qu'ils sont des personnes à part entière avec leur fierté, leur langue, leur culture ; ensuite négocier les questions de territoire, d'autonomie et le reste. Ce qui ne veut pas dire que, quand on négocie il faut tout donner. Ce qui est important c'est de négocier gagnant-gagnant.

Quels sont les rôles du français et de l'anglais au Canada ? Le français et l'anglais sont les deux langues officielles du Canada et, j'ose le dire, de l'Ontario. L'une ne devrait pas être une menace pour l'autre. Nous devrions suivre l'exemple que nous donne les Territoires du Nord-Ouest, où les affaires du gouvernement se mènent dans six ou huit langues officielles avec traduction simultanée ; ou encore, l'exemple des Japonais qui expliquent leurs produits dans au moins cinq langues. Que l'anglais soit internationalement la langue des affaires, personne ne le nie. Cependant, de plus en plus les industries cherchent à comprendre la manière de vivre de leurs clients internationaux. Ici le français fournit une richesse extraordinaire grâce à sa manière de penser et de vivre qui sont différentes. Unies, la langue et la culture de nos communautés nationales nous permettent une meilleure communication avec le monde entier.

Quel est l'avenir du Québec au sein du Canada ? Notre première réaction a été : seul le Québec peut le dire. Mais que l'on fasse n'importe quel découpage politique, les territoires resteront toujours collés. Il y aura toujours besoin de communication et de commerce entre nos deux provinces. De plus, le Québec est une force pour le Canada : commerce, tourisme, identité différente, dépaysement en Amérique quand on veut jouer au touriste. Les autres provinces canadiennes ont peut-être un rôle à jouer dans la décision du Québec de rester dans la Confédération ou non en faisant la promotion interne des différences culturelles francophones.

Quelle est la place de l'Ouest, du Nord, des régions de l'Atlantique ? J'ose donner un peu la même réponse. La place de ces régions est celle qu'elles veulent bien se donner et négocier avec le reste du Canada. Depuis Meech, tout étant remis en question, il faut réévaluer et renégocier notre pays.

Quelle est notre vision du rôle de l'Ontario ? L'Ontario se doit d'exercer son leadership en commençant à l'intérieur de ses frontières, en s'occupant du respect des trois communautés nationales sans chercher à assimiler l'une ou l'autre. Une fois que ces trois communautés sont capables de s'entendre, les autres groupes sentiront qu'ils peuvent vivre leur individualité tout en reconnaissant que ces trois

communautés nationales ont certaines caractéristiques fondamentales inaliénables.

Le Vice-Président : Merci beaucoup. On a le temps pour une question. Mrs O'Neill? We have time for one question.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I must ask you, do you teach le français?

Mme Roy : Oui.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: You certainly know how to express yourself very quickly. There are so many things. I really do think it is a very Windsor perspective and francophone perspective. There are a couple of things you said: the entrepreneurship and your actual philosophy about negotiating. I think you are carrying forward some of your own experience, that it is always going to be that when everyone wins or nobody loses, you have the most successful negotiation. That is a very fundamental principle.

I have a very special interest in cross-border shopping right now, and you mentioned that. Could you say a little bit about that to us, because that is part of our identity, being able to keep our people on this side of the border to do their regular daily tasks. Could you say a little bit about that from your perspective, please.

Mme Roy : Beaucoup de gens que je connais, anglophones et francophones, vont magasiner aux États-Unis. Les prix sont moins chers. J'ai mentionné le prix de l'essence. L'autre jour je revenais d'Ottawa en auto. Je me suis arrêtée à l'autre côté de Chatham pour prendre de l'essence. Ça m'a coûté 56 sous le litre. Je suis arrivée à Belle River, qui est tout près d'ici ; c'était à 49 sous le litre. Alors, déjà là les gens vont regarder d'abord pour leur poche. Qu'on le veuille ou non, c'est ça qui est important pour le monde. Les principes, c'est bon, il faut en avoir ; mais quand ton principe vient en collision avec les besoins de ta famille peut-être, tu vas aller voir là où ça coûte le moins cher.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I just wondered if you had any idea. You have said—

The Vice-Chair: Mrs O'Neill, I would ask you to cut it short. We are really running over time here.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: Okay. I just wondered if you had any idea of things we could do to encourage people to stay on this side for their shopping.

Mme Roy : Revoir les prix, peut-être revoir les taxes.

Mrs Y. O'Neill: I think you are right. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair: At this point the committee needs to make a decision. We have four presenters who are left and we are already running over. Is it the wish of the committee that we give them each five minutes with no questions? So we have a consensus? Okay.

Mr Silipo: Mr Chairman, there are organizations on that list primarily.

The Vice-Chair: There are two individuals and two organizations.

Mr Silipo: Okay, I would suggest that we—

The Vice-Chair: Go 10 and 5?

Mr Silipo: Yes, 10 for the organizations at least.

The Vice-Chair: Okay. All right; that is what we will do.

Mr Offer: Of course, the proviso is if the individuals or organizations are under the limit then we can use the time to ask some questions.

The Vice-Chair: That will bring us to a half-hour. Okay. We will have to follow the time lines strictly because that will bring us 9:30 and people here have to take things down and get ready for tomorrow.

AÎNÉS FRANCOPHONES DU SUD-OUEST DE L'ONTARIO

The Vice-Chair: Okay we would like next to call Gérémie Beaulne. Vous avez demandé cinq minutes.

M. Beaulne : Mesdames et messieurs du comité, bonsoir. Mon nom est Gérémie Beaulne. Je représente la régionale des Aînés francophones du Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario. Je vous remercie de l'occasion qui m'est offerte de présenter un mémoire sur le rôle de l'Ontario au sein de la Confédération.

Nous sommes un organisme à but non lucratif qui comprend 2200 membres et nous sommes affiliés à l'Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario de Windsor et Essex-Kent ainsi qu'à la Fédération des aînés francophones de l'Ontario, qui comprend plus de 12 000 membres et plus de cent clubs.

Les Aînés francophones sont concernés par la possibilité que le Québec veuille se séparer pour devenir autonome. Les francophones et les anglophones sont les deux peuples fondateurs de notre pays. Il est donc important que toutes les provinces demeurent unies pour assurer la survie de la francophonie au milieu minoritaire. Le Québec lui-même est minoritaire au fédéral comme la francophonie est minoritaire au sein des provinces. Il est donc très important que les gouvernements fédéral et provinciaux se penchent sérieusement sur la question pour assurer que le Québec ne se sente pas lésé dans ses droits, tout en insistant à faire respecter les droits des minorités francophones hors Québec.

Pour ce faire, il faut assurer une bonne communication francophone à travers le pays, tant à la radio qu'à la télévision. Il faut aussi assurer la survie de la francophonie, donc : garderies francophones ; gestion scolaire à des francophones pour des francophones ; services collégiaux et universitaires en français ; centres de santé ; services juridiques en notre langue ; développement culturel de nos communautés ; représentants francophones sur différents comités et commissions ; présence francophone chez les sous-ministères. Nous espérons que les recommandations exposées réussiront à faire réfléchir les gouvernements pour arriver à une solution, pour garder notre Canada uni en répondant adéquatement aux besoins de l'un et de l'autre. Nous travaillons présentement à préparer un mémoire qui sera remis à votre bureau bientôt. Je vous remercie, mesdames et messieurs, pour votre temps et votre patience.

2100

WINDSOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY COUNCIL

The Vice-Chair: We would like next to call the Windsor (Ontario) and District Labour Council, Gary Parent. Is

he in the room? Okay, we will go down the list. The Windsor Occupational Health and Safety Council, Jim Brophy. You will have 10 minutes, Mr Brophy.

Mr Brophy: I will just warm up the seat until Gary Parent arrives. I would like to thank you for this opportunity to speak to your committee. Unfortunately it was not confirmed that I would be speaking here tonight until about 11 o'clock this morning. So I have made a series of notes that hopefully I will submit to the committee in the form of a brief in the next month or so.

What I wish to speak to the committee about this evening is an idea that I think comes out of the experience of workers in Windsor about the need for economic democracy to be enshrined or included in the Constitution.

It is interesting to be in this hall this evening. This Saturday, in the hall that is actually adjacent to here, will be a banquet named in honour of Clifton Grant, who was a Scarborough school carpenter who died over a decade ago from cancer caused by exposure to asbestos. He cut acoustical tiles about once a week. This is the ninth year of this banquet and we remember him and we give an award out in his name because of the experience workers have at work, and to remember that there are serious consequences from the lack of power and control we have over the work environment.

I know that tonight people want to have an optimistic posture, but I feel in our community, just to begin my presentation, I need to say that I think many people in our community here feel that we are in the eye of a storm, that really, our impact and our influence on what is happening in our country and on what is happening within our own community is diminishing.

It is important to realize that we have close to 14% unemployment here, that we have a record number of plant closures, that we have the Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association of Canada announcing in the papers that its members are considering setting up operations in the United States or Mexico because of the environmental and occupational health regulations that we have in this province.

Right now, today, you need 16 years' seniority to be working at the Ford Motor Co here in Windsor. We are on the verge, apparently, of negotiating some type of free trade agreement with Mexico. We have already seen what the implications are of the free trade agreement with the United States and one shudders to think what it means to be forced to compete with workers who may be making \$3 to \$4 a day.

We have the GST. We have lost our CBC. We see the privatizations or cutbacks at Via Rail, Air Canada and Petrocan. We are even finding our schools are closing and we seem to have very little control over that whole process. I personally am a director of the United Way here in our community that delivers occupational health and safety information, and we have seen cutbacks through the whole social service area. As you may know, the United Way in Windsor has the highest per capita in the country in terms of giving, and even then we have been forced to see United Way agencies cut back and have reductions.

Given all of those things it is hard, I think, to try to situate what we can do to influence the direction in which our country is going and the Constitution is going, but I think in the area of occupation health possibly Windsor offers a very unique experience.

To say quickly, over 450,000 claims are made every year to the Workers' Compensation Board in Ontario. Over 1,000 workers are expected to die in accidents in the workplace in all of Canada. In Ontario the estimates are that over 6,000 workers die each year, in this province, from occupationally related diseases. This past year, four workers in Windsor have died in accidents at the workplace and thousands more were injured and maimed and diseased because of the conditions at work.

I would like to just very quickly tell you an experience that happened here some 10 years ago to frame what I want to say about why I believe there should be democracy in the workplace and why it should be framed in the Constitution, and that is what happened here at Bendix Automotive of Canada Ltd.

In 1979 the union, which is the auto workers' union, went to the Workers' Compensation Board on behalf of three widows whose husbands had died of cancer while working at the Bendix Automotive plant. It was a brake shoe production plant.

At that meeting the Workers' Compensation Board said: "We have been watching this plant for a long time and we thought something was going to happen there. We thought that something like this would happen."

They said, "You have been?"

And they said, "Well, you've seen this document," and they handed them a document that is a 1966—it was prepared by, I guess at that time, a Ministry of Health inspector, who was doing what today would be done by the Ministry of Labour, who had inspected the plant and found that workers were being exposed to asbestos. He issued orders for different work practices, to stop dry sweeping, have respirators.

They came back into the plant; they reissued it again in 1970. This was the first time the union had seen these documents. Some 13 years later they see documents that are warning them at that point, or warning the company of the dangers.

We know now that in the mid-1970s, X-rays were given and at least in one case a worker was found with a spot on his lung, was not told, was kept in the exposure. We know that in 1978 the industrial hygienist for the company stood in the parking lot and reported that clouds of asbestos were leaving the plant, going over the residential area.

Now, this had a traumatic effect in this community. There are things that have happened in labour history in this community that very few people know about, younger people. What happened at Ford here after the war, with the right for checkoff, was a very important point in labour history in this country. If you go to Ford workers today, very few know about that strike and the importance of it. But if you go to anyone in this community who was here in 1979 and you ask him what happened at Bendix, he can tell you about asbestos, he can tell you about what the

conditions were and he can tell you about a young worker who died of mesothelioma like Clifton Grant; also that the plant left this community in the midst of that, closed its doors and went to the United States, later to South Carolina to avoid even having a union.

This had the most profound effect on the workers in this community because it mirrored for everyone to see what the reality of the work place is. It seems to me that all the reforms that have been attempted over the last 10 years have tried to come to grips with this fundamental fact: that in the workplace, little or no democracy exists for the people who are employed there. They have no control over the work environment. They have no control over what is produced there and how it is produced and under what conditions and what substances are used. And because of that flaw, they continue to be victimized, in spite of millions of dollars being spent on education and on training, because fundamental power relationships exist in such a way that the workers have little control over their environment.

What we accept when we go to work each day would be intolerable in civil society. The rights that we expect in civil society, the right to have some control over our environment, is denied us in the workplace.

2110

I do not know where I am in my notes here, but anyway I had another point. I will use my last second to say that I know many people are coming to talk about Quebec because obviously it is a benchmark for what is going on in our country. I suppose I just wanted to say I lived there for three years. I think anyone in English Canada who was trying to understand what was happening in Quebec and whose only source of information was the media would have a very difficult time understanding why people seem to take the positions that they do. But many of us do support their right to their own national identity and I think it is time that in English Canada we would acknowledge that they are a distinct society and what they need for their own survival and their own protection may not look exactly like what we may need in English Canada and that some accommodation must be made for those national needs that they have.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much. I apologize in regard to the cut in time, but unfortunately we have to stick to our schedule fairly strictly to get through. I would like to thank you on behalf of the committee.

WALTER J. TEMELINI

Mr Temelini: Mr Chairman, I have been asked whether I represent anybody. I do not. I teach Italian at the University of Windsor and I am also the co-ordinator of the new program of multicultural studies and I would like to focus on two points tonight: one, the role of the ethnocultural communities in Confederation, including the linguistic and constitutional debate; two, the economic effects or impact on the teaching and promotion in Ontario and Canada of the heritage languages or ancestral languages, cultures and traditions.

Canada is a multicultural nation. It is in fact, as a result of the July 1988 Multiculturalism Act, the first officially multicultural nation on earth. Multiculturalism has been a

de facto reality for many years. Since the 1971 policy, accepted and recognized by all provincial governments, it has grown into a variety of social and educational programs, finally recognized in law, or *de jure*, in both the Canadian Constitution of 1982, section 27, and by legislation, as I said, in 1988.

Above all, this reality, these programs and this law meant for all Canadians, not just for particular groups, as often mistakenly interpreted, have developed also into a philosophy of life, a social and educational philosophy. Multiculturalism in fact, in its ideal form, according to educators is an ethic. Its main aims are equality, fairness, respect for and among all Canadians. It looks towards ideal citizenship, with equal and shared rights and responsibilities. It involves, therefore, all Canadian—I repeat, all Canadian—structures and infrastructures: governments, education, schools and communities. I have a chart that will show this, which I already made in 1989.

The centre of both the term multiculturalism and of its philosophy is culture in its widest sense. All the manifestations of a group, community and nation, from culinary to literary arts, if you wish, are closely connected to language, the main vehicle of culture. And language, as the linguistic controversy in Canada has been illustrating, is closely linked to identity, to self-expression and self-assurance of individual group and nation.

Canadian Confederation must inevitably be based on the recognition and acceptance of the reality and ideals of multiculturalism. Confederation—a term deriving from a Latin preposition, “com”—with, together—and a noun, “foedus”—a league or alliance—refers to the state of being united in a league, to an alliance of equals among equals. At the base of the word there is also fidelity, loyalty, faithfulness, faithful devotion to duty, to one’s obligation. The Confederation debate without the equal participation of all Canadians, regardless of origin, cannot be a debate at all. It is no longer an issue, as it was perhaps 50 years ago, only of the so-called founding nations. Native peoples and ethnocultural groups are over one third of the Canadian population, but must be made integral parts of the constitutional debate of this new Canadian social and national contract. I have an article for you to read if you wish which I wrote last year, “Conflict, Crisis and Creative Choices.”

Consider the analogy of Canada and the family, which I make in the article. The founding nations may be compared to the parents, the native peoples to the grandparents and the ethnocultural groups to the children. Just as in a family, neither can grandparents nor children be neglected, especially if they have a great deal to contribute, especially, again, when the children are no longer defenceless minors, but mature and responsible adults. The fact is, however, that in Canada, in spite of 20 years of multiculturalism and the Multiculturalism Act, the founding nations still refuse to accept the reality that the children have grown up and want a voice in the family and national deliberations.

The Vice-Chair: I would ask you to come to your conclusions.

Mr Temelini: I will. The mode of thinking and acting in Canada is still that of 50 years ago. The main causes are attitudinal and economic.

Attitudinal: The stereotypes which lead to bias, and often to active discrimination, still persist in Canada for one reason or another. On particular occasions the stereotype becomes openly derisive and destructive. In 1940, it was the Second World War that made official Canada and many Canadians turn against other Canadians—Japanese, Germans, Italians. In 1990 it is the Gulf war making life most difficult for Canadians of Arab descent. Apologies 50 years later will not be good.

Economic obstacles: Always in hard economic times the first elements to be sacrificed to the bottom line are those very bases on which rest the identity and strength of individual citizens in Canada—language and culture.

The Vice-Chair: You have come to the end of the five minutes. I will give you another couple of seconds, that is it, to make your final conclusion. I realize the time is short, but we do have a schedule we have to maintain.

Mr Temelini: I need 30 seconds.

The Vice-Chair: You have it.

Mr Temelini: The example that I was saying is, the University of Western Ontario recently cancelled the Italian and Polish programs. The University of Windsor is slowly eroding the same programs in the department of classical and modern languages, literatures and civilization. Such attitudes and such restricted visions go against both multiculturalism and Confederation. The main danger to the individual and to Canada is, in the final analysis, the erosion of true education as it already has been stated.

"The strength of a nation," said an ancient philosopher, "rests upon the education of its youth." Ontario can strengthen Confederation by strengthening education, as was already stated. Above all, it must strengthen multicultural education, such as what we have at the University of Windsor, and therefore strengthen languages, cultures and identity, which promotes the development of a well-rounded human being and citizen. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair: Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate your tolerance.

WAYNE MANLEY

The Vice-Chair: We have another presenter, Wayne Manley. We are going to ask you to be very strict, to the point of the five minutes. We are getting a little bit over here.

Mr Manley: This committee is supposed to be in the Windsor area to hear the opinions of people of Windsor and the Essex county area about the direction of Ontario, and today a man came in from Quebec and you let him talk well over a half-hour. You thanked him very much and nicely and asked him questions. Later on, a man who was in favour also of French came from Vancouver and you sat here for over a half-hour very contentedly letting him speak. You also let the ex-Premier of Manitoba come—

The Vice-Chair: Sir, sir, excuse me—

Mr Manley: —here and talk for 40 minutes because he is for the French and you did not interrupt him once. I am going to have my say.

The Vice-Chair: Sir, that is not the point. You have five minutes. You can use that five minutes whatever way you want, but after five minutes I will have to ask you to end.

2120

Mr Manley: This panel has already made up its mind. Canada is going to be French no matter what anybody says.

Every day goes by, the more I am convinced that my family is living in a communist state. The politicians tell us what is best for us and we must obey. It is high time the tail stops wagging the dog and the dog shows the tail where the teeth are. Ontario should become a separate country and the sooner the better. Over 50% of my taxes go to support other provinces and enough is enough.

1. As a single income earner, I am tired of over 50% of my income being taxed.

2. Paying the east coast fisherman who only works six months of the year.

3. Paying the western farmers not to grow wheat, and I have to pay for the shipping costs of the wheat when it is grown.

4. Against multiculturalism, which after living together for over 200 years has us at one another's throats in three years.

5. Sending \$2.5 billion of my tax dollars to Quebec every year and having them brag about how wealthy they are.

6. Paying \$3,000 of my money to encourage them to have more children of their distinct society that is going to grow up and despise me.

7. The law that says that Supreme Court judges will be selected by the government and that four out of the nine judges must be from Quebec. This gives Quebec control of all our laws.

8. The Prime Minister constantly running to the Pope for advice on how to run the country. If the Pope wants to run the country, let him come and run for election.

9. Ex-Canadian soldiers recruiting young Quebeckers and training them to fight and die for Quebec.

10. The Quebec Provincial Police purchasing three army tanks to use against the Indians. Who will it be next?

11. The oversized government that is draining the middle class to death. Politicians do not manufacture anything, do not grow anything, mine anything. But what they do real well is to create no-growth jobs like this committee, which produces nothing because you have already made up your minds. It is going to be French Canada or nothing.

12. Tired of feeding dictator countries like Ethiopia, which feeds its 100,000-strong-man army, then uses pictures of starving children to receive more free food while using its money to buy more guns to shoot its own people.

13. A Prime Minister who is despised by 85% of the population insisting that he is serving the people.

14. Joe Clark running around the world supporting small dictator and communist countries. Comrade Joe, who must go.

15. A government that has changed our national anthem 16 times.

The Vice-Chair: You have one minute left, sir.

Mr Manley: No one sings it because they do not know what the words are today.

16. Tired of sending food into countries like India that worship rats and let them eat up over 30% of their own food crops and nearly 50% of the food aid that we paid them.

The Vice-Chair: Sir—

Mr Manley: There are estimated to be five rats for every person in India.

I know I am cut off because I am not French, but you let everybody else from the country come here and talk and this is supposed to be for Windsor and Essex county

and it is not. You made up your mind. It is French Canada or nothing. And you are all dictators.

The Vice-Chair: We would like to thank you very much, sir.

For the benefit of those who are watching, we did extend to the former Premier Pawley who appeared before our committee—there was much interest that was shown by the committee in regard to asking him questions. We expressed a little bit of latitude on that. We apologize to what it meant to others, but this committee felt it was important to ask questions of one of the signatories of the Meech Lake agreement.

We will ask for the last presenter, if he has come in, from the Windsor and District Labour Council, Gary Parent. Has he arrived? Not at all? Okay, this committee will now recess. We will be in London tomorrow, 9:30 in the morning.

The committee adjourned at 9:25.

CONTENTS

Tuesday 19 February 1991

Ernest Guiste	C-515
Jean Mongenais	C-516
Committee of Native Justice	C-517
Ann Iljancic	C-519
Victoria Billingsley	C-522
Michael Hall	C-523
John Meyer	C-525
W. D. Lowe Secondary School	C-526
Paul Paolatto	C-529
Kathy Korenich	C-531
Evening sitting	C-533
Honourable Howard Pawley	C-533
Le Réseau des femmes du Sud de l'Ontario	C-537
Morgan Elliott	C-539
Cheryl Lucier	C-541
Ron Wagenberg	C-543
Association canadienne-française de l'Ontario	C-545
Traditional Teaching Circle Inc	C-547
Association des enseignantes et des enseignants franco-ontariens	C-549
Ainés francophones du Sud-Ouest de l'Ontario	C-551
Windsor Occupational Health and Safety Council	C-551
Walter J. Temelini	C-553
Wayne Manley	C-554
Adjournment	C-555

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ONTARIO IN CONFEDERATION

Chair: Silipo, Tony (Dovercourt NDP)**Vice-Chair:** Bisson, Gilles (Cochrane South NDP)

Beer, Charles (York North L)

Churley, Marilyn (Riverdale NDP)

Eves, Ernie L. (Parry Sound PC)

Harnick, Charles (Willowdale PC)

Harrington, Margaret H. (Niagara Falls NDP)

Malkowski, Gary (York East NDP)

Offer, Steven (Mississauga North L)

O'Neill, Yvonne (Ottawa Rideau L)

Wilson, Fred (Frontenac-Addington NDP)

Winninger, David (London South NDP)

Substitutions:

Arnott, Ted (Wellington PC) for Mr Harnick

Dadamo, George (Windsor-Sandwich NDP) for Mr F. Wilson

MacKinnon, Ellen (Lambton NDP) for Ms Harrington

Clerk: Manikel, Tannis**Staff:**

Kaye, Philip, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Murray, Paul, Research Officer, Legislative Research Office

Hansard Reporting Service, 481 Legislative Building, Toronto Ontario, M7A 1A2 Phone: (416) 965-1456 Fax: (416) 963-1387

2537014

3 1761 1146591 2

